

**Official Transcript of Proceedings**  
**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: Public Meeting on Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the License Renewal of the Westinghouse Columbia Fuel Fabrication Facility in Richland County, South Carolina

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: teleconference

Date: Thursday, August 26, 2021

Work Order No.: NRC-1643

Pages 1-116

**NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.**  
**Court Reporters and Transcribers**  
**1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.**  
**Washington, D.C. 20005**  
**(202) 234-4433**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

STATEMENT FOR THE LICENSE RENEWAL OF THE

WESTINGHOUSE COLUMBIA FUEL FABRICATION FACILITY IN

RICHLAND COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA

+ + + + +

THURSDAY,

AUGUST 26, 2021

+ + + + +

The Commission met at the via  
video/teleconference, at 6:00 p.m. EST, Diana Diaz-  
Toro, Environmental Project Manager, presiding.

PRESENT

DIANA DIAZ-TORO, Environmental Project Manager, NRC

BRETT KLUKAN, NRC

JESSIE QUINTERO, NRC

JEAN TREFETHEN, NRC

JOHN PELCHAT, NRC

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Opening Remarks and Introduction

    By Diana Diaz-Toro . . . . . 3

Environmental Review Process

    By Diana Diaz-Toro . . . . . 8

Public Comments from Elected Officials

    By Brett Klukan . . . . . 24

Public Comments from the Public

    By Brett Klukan . . . . . 59

Meeting Adjournment

    By Diana Diaz-Toro . . . . . 116

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

6:01 p.m.

MS. DIAZ-TORO: Good evening everyone. My name is Diana Diaz-Toro, and I am an environmental project manager at the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, or NRC. I want to welcome you to this NRC virtual public meeting, and personally thank each one of you for taking the time to participate today. Before I proceed, I want to make a few announcements. We're holding this meeting via Webex, and also via a bridge line.

All audio, and including public comments will only be accessible via the bridge line. The video, and the slides will be accessible through the Webex. The Webex events number in the NRC public website has two numbers transposed, and I apologize for that inadvertent error. The correct number for the event in Webex is 1998911794. Now, I said that through the Webex you'll be able to see the presentation.

The presentation can also be accessed via the NRC's ADAMS system using the following session number, ML21236A319, thank you. So, as I said, I'm going to welcome you again after this announcement, and the NRC has prepared a draft environmental impact

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 statement, or draft EIS for the license renewal of the  
2 Westinghouse Columbia Fuel Fabrication Facility in  
3 Hopkins, South Carolina. The draft EIS document is a  
4 result of the NRC staff's evaluation of environmental  
5 impact from the proposed continued operation of the  
6 facility for an additional 40 years.

7 Tonight we're asking for your comments on  
8 that report. The NRC staff typically conducts in  
9 person public meetings to gather comments on draft  
10 EIS's. We recognize that holding this public meeting  
11 virtually is different than our past practice. In  
12 light of the COVID-19, and the recent rise in  
13 transmission rates, the health of everyone is the  
14 priority, and this was an important consideration in  
15 our decision to conduct this meeting in a virtual  
16 manner.

17 We believe that the virtual public meeting  
18 aligns with the NRC's commitment to openness, and  
19 offers the public a gateway to comment on the draft  
20 report. Any comments received during this virtual  
21 public meeting are handled in the same manner as those  
22 comments received at in person meetings. We have a  
23 court reporter with us tonight, and your comments will  
24 be recorded, and transcribed. The transcript of  
25 tonight's meeting will be posted to the NRC's website

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 next week.

2 I do want to stop here, and just say hi to  
3 our court reporter, and if the court reporter can  
4 unmute, and say hi to me back, that would be great.  
5 Okay, all right, I did see him earlier, I'm not sure  
6 why I'm not seeing him now, but we'll continue. In  
7 addition to the court reporter with me today, we have  
8 Brett Klukan, who will be our facilitator, and our  
9 phone operator Kelly, who will provide you with  
10 information later on about how to queue up to provide  
11 a comment tonight.

12 Joining me tonight to listen to your  
13 comments are my branch chief Jessie Quintero, and my  
14 colleague Jean Trefethen, who has been working with me  
15 on the draft EIS, and this public meeting. Colleagues  
16 from the division of fuel management, who are  
17 responsible for the safety evaluation report of the  
18 proposed license renewal, colleagues from our region  
19 two office in Atlanta, Georgia, our Office of  
20 Congressional Affairs, and our Office of Public  
21 Affairs are also with us.

22 Next slide please. The purpose of today's  
23 meeting is to receive your comments on the draft EIS.  
24 Tonight, I will be describing the NRC's licensing  
25 review process, and the NRC's environmental review

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 process for the proposed action. I will also present  
2 the results of the environmental review documented in  
3 the draft EIS, and we'll share how to access the draft  
4 EIS, and how to provide comments. We will then turn  
5 to the most important part of the meeting, gathering,  
6 and listening to your comments.

7 If at the start of your comments you have  
8 procedural questions, such as next steps in the  
9 process, and the licensing review schedule, we will do  
10 our best to answer those. The comments that you  
11 provide tonight, and the comments provided in writing  
12 throughout the draft EIS comment period will be  
13 entered into the public docket for this licensing  
14 action, and will be used to inform the final EIS.  
15 Next slide please.

16 So, what is the proposed action?  
17 Westinghouse submitted an application to the NRC  
18 requesting to renew its operating license for the  
19 Columbia Fuel Fabrication Facility for an additional  
20 40 years. Westinghouse manufactures nuclear fuel  
21 assemblies for commercial nuclear power plants that  
22 generate electricity. The nuclear fuel fabrication  
23 process is shown in the figure on the upper right hand  
24 side of this slide. The Columbia Fuel Fabrication  
25 Facility is located in Hopkins, South Carolina,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 approximately eight miles southeast of the City of  
2 Columbia, as shown in the figure on the bottom left  
3 hand side of the slide.

4 Approximately 68 acres of the property are  
5 used for nuclear fuel manufacturing operations. The  
6 remaining portions of the site consist of woodland  
7 areas, and hard wood forest. The figure on the bottom  
8 right hand side of the slide shows the licensed area  
9 boundary where Westinghouse conducts its NRC licensed  
10 activities. The Westinghouse license renewal request,  
11 if granted as proposed, would allow Westinghouse to  
12 continue to operate the facility for 40 years from the  
13 date the NRC approves the license renewal. Next slide  
14 please.

15 The NRC's role as an independent regulator  
16 is to determine whether the proposed license renewal  
17 complies with the NRC's regulations, which are  
18 designed to be protective of the public, and the  
19 worker's health, and safety, and the environment. The  
20 NRC staff is conducting a safety review, and an  
21 environmental review of the Westinghouse license  
22 renewal application. Both of these reviews are  
23 ongoing, and the NRC has not made a final decision  
24 about the license renewal request. That decision will  
25 be made after both reviews are completed.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1           The safety review is conducted in  
2 accordance with the Atomic Energy Act, and regulations  
3 in 10CFR part 7. The results will be documented in a  
4 safety evaluation report. During the safety review,  
5 the NRC staff evaluates whether the proposed continued  
6 operation of the Columbia Fuel Fabrication Facility  
7 will be safe, and secure, including the evaluation of  
8 consequences of man made, and natural hazards, and it  
9 will protect the public, and the worker's health, and  
10 safety.

11           The environmental review is conducted in  
12 accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act,  
13 or NEPA, and the NRC's NEPA implementing regulations  
14 of 10CFR part 51. The results are documented in an  
15 environmental impact statement, or EIS. The NRC's  
16 regulatory role does not stop after the license  
17 renewal review is complete, but continues with  
18 oversight of the facility. Safety oversight consists  
19 of periodic inspections throughout the life of the  
20 facility, routine assessment of the licensee's  
21 performance, and enforcement in the case that  
22 regulatory requirements are not met. Next slide  
23 please.

24           I will now focus on the environmental  
25 review process. In June 2018, the NRC staff published

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a final environmental assessment and finding of no  
2 significant impact for the proposed license renewal.  
3 Soon after, in July 2018, Westinghouse identified a  
4 leak that released uranium, and hydrofluoric acid into  
5 subsurface environment. Westinghouse also initiated  
6 an investigation under the purview of the South  
7 Carolina Department of Health and Environmental  
8 Control into past leaks from their pipes that also  
9 allowed uranium to enter the subsurface.

10 Based on this new information, and the  
11 public's concern about the releases, the NRC decided  
12 to reopen the environmental review. In October 2019,  
13 the NRC staff concurrently withdrew the 2018  
14 environmental assessment, and published a new draft  
15 environmental assessment for public review, and  
16 comment. In addition to gathering recent comments,  
17 the NRC staff conducted a public meeting in November  
18 2019 to gather verbal comments. In June 2020, the NRC  
19 decided to prepare an EIS for the license renewal  
20 application, because the NRC staff was not able to  
21 reach a finding of no significant impact.

22 This decision was informed by  
23 Westinghouse's interim remedial investigation data  
24 from a report dated February 2020, and developed under  
25 a consent agreement with the state. The new

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 information in this report revealed uncertainties  
2 related to the source, and extent of soil, surface  
3 water, and ground water contamination on site, and the  
4 potential migration pathways, and it was also informed  
5 by public comments submitted to the NRC during the  
6 October 2018 draft environmental assessment public  
7 comment period.

8 Preparation of this EIS is therefore the  
9 next step in the NRC's environmental review process.  
10 On July 31st, 2020, the NRC issued its notice of  
11 intent to prepare an EIS, and began the scoping  
12 process. The NRC staff sought scoping comments  
13 through August 31st, 2020, and published its scoping  
14 summary report in February 2021. After the draft EIS  
15 public comment period ends, the NRC staff will review  
16 the comments provided, and will revise the EIS if  
17 appropriate.

18 The final EIS will also include an  
19 appendix where comments will be recorded, and  
20 responded to. The NRC staff anticipates publishing  
21 the final EIS in February 2022, and issuing the record  
22 of decision in March 2022, next slide please. This  
23 slide shows some of the sources of information that  
24 the NRC staff used to conduct the environmental  
25 review. We started with the information provided by

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Westinghouse in its license renewal application, and  
2 environmental report.

3           We conducted site visits, we requested  
4 additional information from Westinghouse. We  
5 coordinated with other agencies, such as the state's  
6 Department of Health and Environmental Control, and  
7 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. We requested, and  
8 consider information provided by the South Carolina  
9 State Historic Preservation Office of Indian Tribes.  
10 We're also using information resulting from the  
11 remedial investigations that Westinghouse is  
12 conducting under a consent agreement with the state,  
13 and we also consider the comments provided during the  
14 public comments periods for the October 2019 draft  
15 environmental assessment, and the EIS scoping. Next  
16 slide please.

17           The NRC staff evaluated environmental  
18 impact from the proposed 40 year license renewal, the  
19 no action alternative, and the 20 year license renewal  
20 alternative. Under the no action alternative,  
21 Westinghouse would continue to operate the fuel  
22 fabrication facility under its current operating  
23 license, which expires in September of 2027. After  
24 the license expires, the decommissioning process for  
25 the facility would begin in accordance with 10CFR part

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 70 unless Westinghouse requests, and obtains a renewed  
2 license.

3 The NRC staff also analyzed environmental  
4 impact from the renewal of the license for a shorter  
5 license term. Based on the history of events at the  
6 facility, Westinghouse ongoing remedial  
7 investigations, and the last license renewal term, the  
8 NRC staff evaluated a 20 year license renewal. The  
9 NRC staff impact evaluation also considered cumulative  
10 impact. The NRC has established three significance  
11 levels for assessing environmental impact.

12 The definitions for small, moderate, and  
13 large impacts are presented in this slide. In  
14 evaluating the impact, and determining the  
15 significance levels, the NRC looks at whether the  
16 proposed action would affect, and how it would affect  
17 a resource. Next slide please. This slide summarizes  
18 the environmental impact from the proposed action, the  
19 no action alternative, and the 20 year license renewal  
20 alternative on different environmental resource areas.

21 The NRC staff found that impact from the  
22 proposed action in the 20 year license renewal  
23 alternative would result in small impact on all  
24 resource areas except for ground water resources, for  
25 which impact would range from small, to moderate.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Under the no action alternative the NRC staff found  
2 that impact on those resources would be small. Impact  
3 on ground water resources would range from small, to  
4 moderate, and impact on socioeconomics would be  
5 moderate based on the loss of jobs, and associated  
6 economic impact upon the facility's license expiration  
7 in 2027 when the facility would cease operation, and  
8 start the decommissioning process if no request for  
9 renewal of the license at that time is submitted to  
10 the NRC.

11 With respect to cumulative impact, the NRC  
12 staff determined that the proposed license renewal  
13 would contribute small incremental impacts on all  
14 resource areas, except for ground water resources.  
15 Additionally, because the past operation of the  
16 facility has had noticeable effects on the water  
17 quality of the on site ground water that continues to  
18 be observed in the most recent data, and on the water  
19 quality of the on site surface water bodies, including  
20 past exceedance of water quality standards, the NRC  
21 staff concluded that the cumulative impact to ground  
22 water, and surface water resources from past  
23 operations are moderate.

24 Next slide please. Westinghouse manages  
25 effluent waste streams, and conducts radiological, and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 nonradiological effluent, and environmental  
2 monitoring, and sampling. Westinghouse has also  
3 implemented additional sampling, and monitoring to  
4 characterize the subsurface, and investigate the  
5 source, and extent of the contamination in accordance  
6 with a consent agreement with the state. Westinghouse  
7 sampling, and monitoring program includes samples of  
8 air, surface water, soil, vegetation, fish, ground  
9 water, the Congaree River, and sediment.

10 The table shown in this slide describes  
11 the type of sample, analysis, and sampling frequency.  
12 During the license renewal period, Westinghouse would  
13 be required to continue monitoring. AS a condition of  
14 the renewed license, if the license is renewed,  
15 Westinghouse would be required to submit its  
16 environmental sampling, and monitoring programs to the  
17 NRC, or review an approval upon either the state's  
18 approval of the remedial investigation report, or  
19 within five years of the license renewal, whichever  
20 comes first.

21 Westinghouse would also be required to  
22 enter exceedances of federal, and state water  
23 regulatory limits into its corrective action plan.  
24 Westinghouse has also committed in its license renewal  
25 application, to submitting the environmental

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 monitoring, and sampling program to the NRC staff  
2 again for review, and approval at the completion of  
3 the implementation of the consent agreement. Next  
4 slide please.

5 Historical operations at the facility have  
6 affected the quality of soil, and sediments near, or  
7 inside the plant building, for example from the  
8 hydrochloric acid spiking station, and from  
9 intermodal, or sealant containers in the southern  
10 storage area. Past, and ongoing remediation efforts  
11 have been directed at removing soils contaminated at  
12 above action levels. Westinghouse criteria for  
13 immediate remediation is based on impacts on workers,  
14 and industrial standards.

15 The NRC staff also reviewed the results of  
16 soil sampling from around the site to evaluate the  
17 presence of potential technetium 99 sources. While  
18 there is no indication of an active source, the source  
19 of the technetium 99 contamination is unknown.  
20 Westinghouse continues to conduct soil sampling as  
21 part of the implementation of the consent agreement,  
22 and the NRC staff will review new information  
23 resulting from these anticipated samplings, and  
24 determine the next steps as appropriate.

25 Soil at a distance from the operational

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 areas have only been minimally affected to date.  
2 Based on the remediation efforts, the remedial  
3 investigations, and the new license conditions if the  
4 license is renewed, the NRC staff found that impacts  
5 to soils would be small. Next slide please. The City  
6 of Columbia provides water from the Congaree River to  
7 its customers, including Westinghouse.

8 The Westinghouse site is a relatively  
9 small consumer, only using a minor fraction of the  
10 water from the City of Columbia, and 80 percent of the  
11 water is returned to the Congaree River under  
12 permitted discharges. Potential impact on the water  
13 quality of the river under the proposed actions can  
14 result from the continued discharge of liquid  
15 effluents directly into the river. Westinghouse  
16 monitors water quality above, and below the site's  
17 discharge.

18 Liquid discharges must meet the limits set  
19 in the national pollutants discharge elimination  
20 system permit, and the NRC's effluent limits for  
21 radiological constituents. The table here shows that  
22 the amount of uranium released to the Congaree River  
23 has decreased since 2007. It also illustrates that  
24 since Westinghouse began to monitor for technetium 99,  
25 detected levels have generally decreased over time.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Next slide please.

2 On site surface water bodies at the site  
3 include Mill Creek, Sunset Lake, and Gator Pond, none  
4 of which are a source of drinking water, or used for  
5 operations at the facility. These on site surface  
6 water bodies have been noticeably affected by past  
7 plant activities. The principal means by which  
8 contaminated surface water can move beyond the site  
9 boundary is through flow in Mill Creek. Mill Creek is  
10 currently monitored as part of the NRC license  
11 requirement from the entrance at upper Sunset Lake, to  
12 the exit from the Westinghouse property.

13 Results from this monitoring show minor  
14 differences in contaminants at the entrance at upper  
15 Sunset Lake, and where it exits the property  
16 indicating that radionuclear releases from operations  
17 have a minor impact on water quality in Mill Creek.  
18 It results in a low potential for contaminants in the  
19 site because of the implementation of activities, and  
20 programs to minimize the effects of releases on other  
21 uses of the local surface water.

22 This mitigation includes, but is not  
23 limited to environmental procedures Westinghouse has  
24 developed to inform decisions about changes to its  
25 monitoring protocols based on information learned from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the remedial investigations, and the new license  
2 conditions related to environmental monitoring that  
3 would be part of a renewed license, if the license is  
4 renewed. The NRC will also continue inspect  
5 Westinghouse compliance with its NRC license  
6 environmental monitoring program.

7 Therefore the NRC staff found that impact  
8 to surface water would be small. Next slide please.  
9 Ground water at the Westinghouse facility has been  
10 noticeably contaminated with volatile organic  
11 compounds, inorganics, uranium, and technetium 99 from  
12 inadvertent spills, and leaks from past operations.  
13 Westinghouse does not currently withdraw ground water  
14 for any operational needs, so the evaluation that we  
15 conducted focused on potential impact of continued  
16 operations on the quality of the ground water.

17 Westinghouse has installed additional  
18 ground water monitoring wells. Recent ground water  
19 monitoring shows water quality standards are exceeded  
20 for volatile organic compounds, fluoride nitrate,  
21 uranium, and technetium 99. The existing ground water  
22 sampling data indicates however that the contaminants  
23 resulting from past operational activity currently  
24 remain on site. Actions taken by Westinghouse in  
25 response to past contaminant releases have also

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reduced the likelihood of future inadvertent releases.

2 For instance, Westinghouse plans to close  
3 the east and sanitary lagoon, and they have removed  
4 the former oil house, and southern storage area  
5 containers. However, future inadvertent releases of  
6 contaminants are reasonably foreseeable considering  
7 the uncertainties about past leaks, and the potential  
8 for the risk of leaks to increase with the age of  
9 plant components. Based on the information evaluated  
10 today, the ground water contamination is not likely to  
11 travel beyond the property boundary during the period  
12 of the proposed actions due to the implementation of  
13 activities, and programs to minimize the effects of  
14 releases on other uses of the local ground water  
15 resources.

16 However, uncertainties remain about the  
17 ultimate state, and transfer of ground water  
18 contamination at the site, and therefore the NRC staff  
19 found that impacts to ground water resources would  
20 range from small, to moderate. Westinghouse continues  
21 to characterize the subsurface, and investigate the  
22 sources, and extent of contamination through a consent  
23 agreement with the state, and the NRC will review new  
24 information resulting from this investigation, and  
25 determine next steps as appropriate. Next slide

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 please.

2 As part of its environmental review, the  
3 NRC staff also evaluated potential impacts for  
4 historic, and cultural resources. Commensurate with  
5 the scope, and nature of the proposed action, the NRC  
6 staff consulted cultural resource reports, and  
7 historic context information available at the South  
8 Carolina Department of Archaeology and Historic  
9 Preservation, the South Carolina Institute of  
10 Archaeology and Anthropology, and conducted a search  
11 in arch sites (Phonetic.)

12 The NRC staff also consulted with the  
13 South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office of  
14 Indian Tribes, and reviewed information provided by  
15 members of the public during the October 2019 draft  
16 environmental assessment, public comment period, and  
17 the EIS scoping comment period. The NRC staff  
18 considered areas within the licensed area boundary  
19 that have been undisturbed, and those that were  
20 previously disturbed by the construction, and  
21 operation of the facility.

22 In its license renewal application,  
23 Westinghouse did not request changes to its NRC  
24 license activity, nor construction of new buildings,  
25 or structures that would result in land disturbances

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 potentially affecting cultural resources. As part of  
2 the remedial investigation reports, Westinghouse has  
3 installed new monitoring wells. Installation of these  
4 wells is short term, and involves minimal land  
5 disturbance.

6 Future ground water disturbing activities,  
7 such as irradiation of contaminated soil could occur  
8 within the disturbed areas of the site. However soils  
9 in this area have been extensively disturbed by  
10 construction, and operation of the facility.  
11 Westinghouse has also established site wide  
12 procedures, and provisions with the goal of avoiding,  
13 and minimizing impact on historic, and cultural  
14 resources in the conduct of all ground disturbing  
15 activity, including those being conducted as part of  
16 the implementation of the consent agreement.

17 For example, the procedures that plant  
18 personnel conduct ground penetrating radar are another  
19 applicable alternative method to identify potential  
20 subsurface cultural resource anomalies prior to the  
21 start of any work in undisturbed areas of the site.  
22 The procedure proposal includes stop work, and  
23 notifications for the South Carolina State Historic  
24 Preservation Office of Indian Tribes in the event of  
25 an unanticipated discovery of cultural resource, or

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 human remains.

2 In the NRC's October 2019 draft  
3 environmental assessment, the NRC staff concluded that  
4 historic, and cultural resources would not be  
5 affected. After considering the new information  
6 gathered in preparing this draft EIS, the NRC staff  
7 continued to find that no historic, and cultural  
8 resources would be affected by the proposed license  
9 renewal. Additionally, Westinghouse is currently  
10 executing a cultural resource survey. Next slide  
11 please.

12 The draft EIS can be accessed via NRC  
13 ADAMS in searching for session number ML21209A213. A  
14 link to the draft EIS can also be found on the NRC's  
15 web page for the Columbia Fuel Fabrication Facility,  
16 and the web addresses are noted in this slide. And I  
17 do want to take a second opportunity to again repeat  
18 the ML number for the slides, the presentation that  
19 I'm providing today, and that is ML21236A319.  
20 Additionally, copies of the draft EIS can be found in  
21 the main branch of the Richland Public Library, and  
22 the Lower Richland, and Eastover branches.

23 The NRC staff announced the draft EIS  
24 comment period, and this public meeting webinar via  
25 the NRC's web page, FRN, federal register notice,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 email distribution list, and LISTSERV, via  
2 announcements in local newspapers such as The State,  
3 and The Columbia Star, and local radio stations WGCB,  
4 WFMV, WTCB, and WNKT. We also sent postcards to  
5 approximately a five to six mile radius around the  
6 Columbia Fuel Fabrication Facility announcing the  
7 draft EIS comment period, and the public meeting  
8 webinar.

9 We also distributed an informational sheet  
10 about the draft EIS. Next slide please. The comment  
11 period for the draft EIS ends on September 20th. You  
12 can comment in a variety of ways. You can comment  
13 tonight during this meeting, you can also send an  
14 email to WEC\_CFFF\_EIS@nrc.gov. You can go online to  
15 www.regulations.gov, and search for docket ID NRC-  
16 2015-0039. You can also leave a comment via voice  
17 mail by calling standard toll free number 1800-216-  
18 0881, or you can mail us a comment. Next slide  
19 please.

20 For additional information, you can  
21 contact me via phone, or email. You can also contact  
22 Mr. David Tiktinski who is the licensing project  
23 manager for the facility, or Mr. Tom Vukovinsky senior  
24 fuel facility inspector in our region two office in  
25 Atlanta, Georgia. For the media, you can contact Mr.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 Dave McIntyre from our Office of Public Affairs. And  
2 our contact information is provided in this slide.  
3 Next slide please.

4 This concludes my presentation. I want to  
5 thank you for your time this evening, and most  
6 importantly for your participation in the public  
7 comment period for this draft EIS. I will now turn it  
8 to our facilitator, Brett Klukan.

9 MR. KLUKAN: Hello everyone, again, my  
10 name is Brett Klukan. Normally I am the regional  
11 counsel for region one of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
12 Commission. However tonight I will be facilitating  
13 the public comment portion of this meeting. Before we  
14 open the meeting to comments by members of the public,  
15 we would like to start with any elected officials, or  
16 representatives of elected officials who would either  
17 like to quote unquote stand, and be recognized, or to  
18 give prepared remarks, and we'd particularly like to  
19 start with any representatives of any Native American  
20 Tribes.

21 So, if you are a tribal official, or a  
22 representative of a tribal official who would like to  
23 offer a prepared remark at this time, please press  
24 star one on your phone. Once you've done that, please  
25 unmute your phone, you'll be asked to state, and spell

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 your name, and any affiliation, then press the pound  
2 key to return back to the meeting. Otherwise you will  
3 not be able to hear the meeting until the time delay  
4 finishes.

5 If you want to leave the queue for any  
6 reason, you can press star two on your phone. So,  
7 again, we're now asking for tribal representatives to  
8 press star one on their phone if they would like to be  
9 recognized as attending the meeting tonight, or to  
10 give a prepared remark at this time. So, please queue  
11 up, and we will see if anyone enters into the queue.  
12 Thank you again. Moderator, please feel free to go  
13 ahead, and unmute if we have anyone in the queue at  
14 this time.

15 THE OPERATOR: Well, our first comment is  
16 going to come from Representative Annie McDaniel, your  
17 line is open.

18 REPRESENTATIVE MCDANIEL: Yes, thank you  
19 so much for acknowledging me, and thank you all for  
20 the presentation. I just wanted to share just a few  
21 comments. I thought the presentation was a good  
22 presentation, however I am concerned about the reach,  
23 and whether, or not the advertisement of the public  
24 comments, and whether, or not the receipt of the  
25 advertisement reached the audience that it should have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reached.

2           So, I think the deadline was extended a  
3 little bit, but I'm asking that -- I don't know the  
4 schedule for a repeat of this webinar, but I'm  
5 requesting that it is repeated, and, or maybe sent  
6 out, maybe through social media, maybe through some of  
7 the public radio stations, public TV stations.  
8 Oftentimes when this kind of information needs to be  
9 disseminated to our general audience, it seems to miss  
10 that mark.

11           And I've had conversations with a few  
12 individuals who was not aware, and I think information  
13 -- I've received the email, but I receive a lot of  
14 emails, so that was not the best mode of communication  
15 for me. A phone call probably would have been better,  
16 and then I would assist in getting the notification  
17 out once I was made aware that we were having the  
18 public comment session today, and I searched my state  
19 house email, then I saw that the emails had been sent  
20 there.

21           But elected officials, I know we at the  
22 House of Representatives for the State of South  
23 Carolina, we do not check our emails every day. And  
24 even though we try to, we get so many, and  
25 particularly now, when we have so many issues going on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with the rescue money, and with the wearing a mask,  
2 and the open gun carry, we have so many issues that  
3 our constituents are really, really concerned about,  
4 so I miss those emails.

5 So, I just need for us to do a better job,  
6 maybe someone from the NRC can have someone from there  
7 call the elected officials, and ask us to disseminate  
8 the information to our constituency, send texts. Just  
9 something that we can put our hands on more readily,  
10 and then we can go, and check our emails so that we  
11 can try to be sure that the audience that should  
12 receive this information is broad, and also wide.  
13 Again, thank you for allowing me to make these  
14 comments, and if there are any questions, I would be  
15 more than happy to answer.

16 Again my name is State Representative  
17 Annie E. McDaniel, and I represent all of FairField  
18 County, a portion of Chester County, and also a  
19 portion of Richland County, and we do have the nuclear  
20 reactors from now Dominion Energy located within  
21 Fairfield County, and I'm also very concerned about  
22 what happens in East Dover with the Westinghouse  
23 Plant, as it is still a portion of the great state  
24 that I reside in, and that is the State of South  
25 Carolina. Again, thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Thank you. Go ahead  
2 Brett, sorry.

3 MR. KLUKAN: No, I was just going to thank  
4 her for the comment, so please.

5 MS. DIAZ-TORO: No, I also want to thank  
6 her, and I want to thank you for coming the time to  
7 come to this public webinar, and participate today,  
8 and I have made note that certainly we can call  
9 elected officials. I also wanted to sort of provide  
10 additional information about how the NRC conducted its  
11 outreach activities, and we did try to reach to  
12 hopefully the community around the facility. So, in  
13 addition to the typical ones that we use, which are  
14 the announcement through the NRC web page, or the  
15 federal register notice.

16 We did send information, have been sending  
17 information via email, and we also developed an  
18 information sheet that we sent via email. And also for  
19 the past two weeks, we have been announcing the public  
20 meeting webinar via a couple of local newspapers, The  
21 State, and The Columbia Star, and also through three,  
22 or four local radio stations as well. Additionally,  
23 we also sent postcards to residents around a five to  
24 six mile radius around the facility, and announcing  
25 the draft EIS, and the public comment period, and the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 public comment webinar.

2 So, I do, we are listening to you, and we  
3 continue to listen, and I want to thank you for  
4 offering to contact you, so that you can also help us  
5 continue to advertise, and announce. I'm not sure if  
6 you're -- there are other individuals of course  
7 listening into this conversation in this public  
8 meeting webinar, so either you can email me  
9 separately, and privately with your phone number, and  
10 I'll make sure that I contact you.

11 My email address is -- I pronounce my name  
12 Diana, but you can call me Diana as well, I'll answer  
13 to both. It's Diana, D as in David, I-A-N as in  
14 Nancy, A dot D as in David, I-A-Z as in Zebra dash T  
15 as in Tom, O as in Oscar, R as in Robert, O as in  
16 Oscar at nrc.gov. Again, I thank you, and we'll be in  
17 contact. Thank you Brett.

18 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you again. Moderator,  
19 could we unmute our, it seems like we have a few more  
20 queued up, so could we unmute the next speaker please?

21 THE OPERATOR: Absolutely, our next caller  
22 is Robert Reese, and go ahead, your line is open.

23 MR. REESE: Can you hear me? Hello?

24 MR. KLUKAN: Yes, we can hear you, thank  
25 you. We can hear you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. REESE: So, I want to say that one, I  
2 reside in the Lower Richland community, and grew up in  
3 this area, and I come from a family that has about  
4 five generations of relatives that grew up in this  
5 community, and I was really pleased to hear the  
6 president lay out his vision for America that included  
7 tackling the climate crisis, and confronting our  
8 racial inequities, and possibly solving the most  
9 pressing problems of our day while ensuring that  
10 public health is a priority.

11 And it was interesting also to hear the  
12 EPA administrator, Michael Regan, talk about the first  
13 100 days, and that the EPA work force was moving with  
14 urgency to deliver on this administration's agenda.  
15 What was problematic, or what has been problematic is  
16 to know that I live in a community that the president  
17 says he is focusing on, and we're still plagued with  
18 racial inequalities, or inequities. That our most  
19 pressing issues are a nuclear power plant, a coal  
20 powered plant, a paper plant, and a fiberglass plant  
21 all in our community.

22 And that the climate is wreaking havoc on  
23 Lower Richland. There's a reason why we're called  
24 lower, and not just Richland County. The demography  
25 of our area is that we are at the lower part of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 county, so flooding is more prevalent, and that we  
2 have a nuclear plant right next door to the state's  
3 only national park, a swamp. And it's interesting  
4 also, that we just had a hundred year flood that  
5 impacted our area, and as many of us know on this  
6 call, we've got the expectations for increased  
7 rainfall for the next few years because of the way  
8 that water is being evaporated from our oceans.

9 And then we're having higher incidence of  
10 rainfall, and the water is just collecting in our  
11 community, and that water is also migrating to the  
12 Westinghouse area, and impacting the floor, or  
13 whatever contaminants that are there on that plant.  
14 I'm concerned, and I guess my question for you all  
15 are, I got two questions, one is what has the EPA  
16 done, or what is the EPA doing to ensure that the  
17 administration's focus, or urgency on working with  
18 communities such as ours, how is that matter being  
19 sort of layered on this issue?

20 And then I just wanted to want you all to  
21 know that the community does not, it doesn't go  
22 unnoticed that when we have these types of licensure  
23 issues that now miraculously we have this Westinghouse  
24 advisory committee that's convened, it's been really  
25 convenient that this convening of this advisory

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 committee has happened when this environmental impact  
2 statement was announced. We haven't heard from the  
3 Westinghouse plant before this, we're hopeful that  
4 this continues, but nobody seems to believe that it  
5 will.

6 And so we're concerned that this process  
7 has not taken into consideration the vastly majority,  
8 vastly low income residents, and I want to know, the  
9 second question that I have is what's the precedent  
10 for these comments changing the outcome of a license  
11 agreement? I mean is there any precedent where a  
12 community's input has had any impact on the process?  
13 And I'll wait to hear a response, thanks.

14 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Thank you representative,  
15 this is Diana Diaz-Toro, and I appreciate your taking  
16 the time to participate tonight in our public meeting  
17 webinar. The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the  
18 NRC is conducting two reviews of this license renewal  
19 application, I apologize. One is the safety review  
20 where the NRC staff looks at whether the proposed  
21 license renewal that Westinghouse has requested  
22 complies with our regulations, which are protective of  
23 the public, and worker's health, and safety.

24 And that includes the assessment of  
25 accident scenarios, man made, and natural hazards such

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 as flooding for example. That review sir is ongoing,  
2 and it has not been completed yet. That is expected  
3 to be completed in early calendar year 2022. The  
4 other part of the review that we're conducting is the  
5 environmental review under the National Environmental  
6 Policy Act.

7 And we have recently published this draft  
8 environmental impact statement where we looked at  
9 different resource areas, and how the proposed  
10 continued operation of this facility for the 40 years  
11 would impact those resources. And some of the  
12 resources that we looked at are surface water, ground  
13 water resources, ecology, historic, and cultural  
14 resources, land use, official environmental justice as  
15 well is another one that we looked at in our draft  
16 EIS.

17 So, right now, as you are aware, we are  
18 seeking public comments, and so with respect to your  
19 question about how these comments might affect the  
20 outcome of the, for example this environmental review,  
21 one example that I can share with you is that when the  
22 NRC started the review of this license renewal  
23 request, we started with an environmental assessment  
24 rather than an environmental impact assessment. And  
25 the environmental assessment process has two outcomes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Either a finding of no significant impact, and if we  
2 cannot reach a finding of no significant impact, then  
3 the next step is to prepare an environmental impact  
4 statement.

5 And that is exactly sir, what happened  
6 when we prepared the environmental assessment. The  
7 NRC staff was not able to reach a finding of no  
8 significant impact, and we did look at the comments  
9 provided from the members of the public, and from  
10 external stakeholders, including state agencies, and  
11 local agencies during the environmental assessment  
12 review process, and we also looked at reports that  
13 Westinghouse was providing to the state under a  
14 consent agreement that they have executed with the  
15 state.

16 And based on the information from that  
17 report, it's related to remedial investigations of  
18 contaminated, the level of ground water, and surface  
19 water. The NRC staff reached a conclusion that we  
20 couldn't reach a finding of no significant impact, and  
21 so we're conducting this EIS. So, that's one example  
22 that I can share with you sir, about that the NRC does  
23 look at public comments, that they do play a  
24 significant role in our environmental review. And  
25 hopefully I answered your question.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you again for your  
2 question, and comments. Moderator, could you please  
3 unmute our next speaker please?

4 THE OPERATOR: Our next caller is Chief  
5 Michelle Mitchum, please go ahead.

6 CHIEF MITCHUM: Hello, can you hear me?

7 MR. KLUKAN: Yes, we can hear you.

8 CHIEF MITCHUM: Thank you. First, I want  
9 to thank you all for putting this slide together, and  
10 having this meeting. I agree with Representative  
11 McDaniel, that there are a number of people who did  
12 not have enough notice to be able to participate in  
13 this, so I do hope that this is held again. But to  
14 move on, first, and foremost, I am the chief of Pine  
15 Hill Indian Tribe, we are indigenous to the area. Our  
16 position is that we are requesting no action on this  
17 permit for a number of reasons.

18 Going through the draft environmental  
19 impact statement, there seem to be a number of  
20 contradictory statements, and it's very confusing, but  
21 to try, and narrow this down a bit, I discovered some  
22 additional information over the past 24 hours. One,  
23 the environmental impact statement does not mention  
24 the installation of, it looks like 32 more wells that  
25 are done under the agreement between Westinghouse, and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DHEC, and I'm curious if an archaeologist is  
2 supervising the installation of these wells while  
3 we're saying that there's no impact on the ground,  
4 obviously there is.

5 That was one thing I wanted to point out.  
6 There is a -- in year five you put that in its license  
7 renewal application Westinghouse did not request  
8 changes to its licensed activities, or construction of  
9 new buildings, and obviously they are. And it seems  
10 to me that installing wells would disturb the land.  
11 Westinghouse, my understanding, has agreed to an  
12 intensive archaeological survey being conducted, I  
13 believe it's supposed to start this month, with the  
14 final being approved by the State Historic  
15 Preservation Office in South Carolina around February  
16 of next year.

17 Which is the same time frame that these  
18 final drafts will be -- the impact statement will be  
19 ready, and potentially the decision made by the NRC.  
20 The assessment about the license just cannot be made  
21 without the results of this archaeological survey. We  
22 can't make intelligent decisions, or comments in  
23 response to these statements that are being published  
24 without all of the information in front of us. And I  
25 feel that we are being short changed, because this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 cultural piece is not in place.

2 The Pine Hill Indian Tribe being from the  
3 area, we also recognize that the Green Hill Mound is  
4 near Westinghouse. This is a historic cemetery  
5 important to Native Americans, not just my people,  
6 although it's thought to be ancestral to my tribe.  
7 And it is presently not protected under the Native  
8 American Graves Protection Act. So we would request  
9 that the area of potential effect be expanded to  
10 include the Green Hill Mound, and the new license  
11 should be increased to include the archaeological site  
12 in this cultural, and historical piece of the  
13 environmental impact statement.

14 No new license should be approved without  
15 the results of this archaeological study. Also there  
16 is the historic African American, and I argue Native  
17 American cemetery, because we cannot say with  
18 certainty that every person in the cemetery, whether  
19 known, or unknown is actually only African American.  
20 I do believe there are people who are free people of  
21 color, and Native American in the cemetery. The draft  
22 environmental impact statement reads as if there is no  
23 impact on the cemetery at all.

24 But it also reads as if the impact area is  
25 one inch beyond the front door of the facility. So,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I take issue with that, I do not think any wells, of  
2 any type should be installed anywhere near the  
3 proximity of the cemetery because of the potential  
4 impact it will have on the cemetery, and those bodies  
5 in the cemetery. Hopkins, I want to point out, is  
6 designated by the Health Resources and Services  
7 Administration as a medically under served area, and  
8 medically under served population.

9 And as such, the Town of Hopkins in its  
10 entirety, it deserves better from Westinghouse. It  
11 deserves much more protection from health threats, and  
12 I do not feel that the environmental impact statement,  
13 while it addresses environmental justice, it gives no  
14 weight at all to health concerns that may arise, or be  
15 correlated to hazardous spills, or toxic exposure to  
16 the people of the area, and health issues. I also  
17 question why more weight is being focused on the  
18 uncertain future in a 20, or 40 year license rather  
19 than reflecting on what we know of 52 years of factual  
20 evidence, which is cluttered with violations, and  
21 hazards.

22 I don't think that it's very fair to throw  
23 the economy of Hopkins alongside an uncertain future  
24 of a potential 20, or 40 year license when any affect  
25 on the economy, if the NRC were to entertain a no

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 action, and let the decommission process start, the  
2 economy effect is a short term effect. We can't -- I  
3 don't think anybody can effectively predict that the  
4 economy of Hopkins is going to be so devastated that  
5 Hopkins is going to dry up over the next 40 years  
6 because Westinghouse is not there.

7 We can't say that, so I think that it's  
8 unfair to throw the economy in there as a deciding  
9 factor. If we're also not going to weigh in on the  
10 health effects that Westinghouse may be posing.  
11 Again, I stress that the area of impact needs to be  
12 expanded. I'm very concerned about Green Hill Mound,  
13 I'm concerned about the family cemetery, the historic  
14 canal that's referenced in the report, I'm concerned  
15 of that.

16 I'm concerned for the people the in the  
17 area that live there. I would not be doing my duty to  
18 my tribe if I were not trying to protect our original  
19 indigenous location. I do appreciate your time in  
20 allowing me to speak, and again, thank you for putting  
21 this together, and getting all of us the opportunity  
22 to speak, thank you.

23 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you very much for your  
24 comments, we really appreciate your participation in  
25 the meeting tonight. And again, they will be included

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 as part of the transcript for the meeting, and  
2 captured in the comments of record on the EIS. So,  
3 moderator could we have our next speaker please?

4 THE OPERATOR: Yes, our next caller is  
5 going to be David, David your line is open.

6 MR. OVERLY: Hello, can you hear me?

7 MR. KLUKAN: Yes, we can hear you.

8 MR. OVERLY: Hello, thank you all for  
9 having this meeting tonight. Personally, I don't have  
10 a problem with nuclear, to me it's the ultimate green  
11 energy. But some things that I've heard tonight  
12 really kind of raised my curiosity a lot. I have to  
13 be forthright, I'm a 25 year hydro geologist, and so  
14 a lot of the stuff I heard, I kind of squinted a  
15 little bit. The first thing I kind of draw question  
16 to is when you indicate that a level of contamination  
17 is listed as quote moderate.

18 I mean, your moderate might be my slight,  
19 my slight might be your extreme, that to me is a very  
20 disingenuous way to describe the contamination. If  
21 you're finding volatiles in a creek, I don't know much  
22 about Mill Creek, I don't know what the setting  
23 (inaudible) is for that creek, but if you're pulling  
24 grass samples, and you're actually getting a  
25 measurable result, that tells me the true result is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 much higher, because of all the dilution that would go  
2 along with moving water, and what not.

3 Also, and I'm doing this by phone, I don't  
4 have access to a computer right now to actually watch  
5 the slides, and I've been trying to find any kind of  
6 data on the site as far as ground water, and see how  
7 much has been reviewed by geologists, where for  
8 example the wells are located. Were they located just  
9 randomly, or was there any thought as far as any flow  
10 nets used to show ground water movement, those kind of  
11 things.

12 The placing of wells can be very vital, if  
13 you don't have wells in the right spots you're not  
14 going to catch the things that you're looking for.  
15 So, those are just some of my general comments that I  
16 just, the main thing is when I heard moderate, I  
17 couldn't imagine someone saying well contamination at  
18 the site is moderate. No, I need a number. Tell me  
19 what number you got, what value you got, not just some  
20 generic term like moderate, or slight, or anything  
21 like that. And I'm not sure if any geologist reviewed  
22 the ground water data from this, how often it's done,  
23 and everything, because again, I have not been able to  
24 see those documents.

25 So, my question would be how often are the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 wells sampled, and what are they sampled for, and who  
2 reviews such data? I think that's pretty much all I  
3 got for that, but yeah, I just would like to be able  
4 to review all this data to have a better understanding  
5 of what's truly going on here because hearing that  
6 there's ground water contamination, and ground water  
7 contamination doesn't recognize, well here's our  
8 property boundary, I'm going to stay here.

9 Just because you say it's on site, it's  
10 still there, it's not something that's naturally  
11 occurring, so I would want to make sure that this  
12 stuff is definitely not migrating off site, and so we  
13 have a better idea of what's going on at the site.  
14 But thank you very much for your time, thank you.

15 MR. KLUKAN: And could we have your last  
16 name? You don't have to give it if you don't want to,  
17 but just for the transcript, could you give us your  
18 last name, or say it out loud? Sorry, I was on mute  
19 there for a second. So, right now, again, we're just  
20 trying to go through, we were starting with tribal  
21 representatives, but we've kind of shifted into  
22 elected officials as well. So, are there any other  
23 elected officials, or representatives of elected  
24 officials, whether they be federal, state, or local  
25 who would like to either just say you're in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 meeting tonight, you'd like to let people know you're  
2 here, or that you would like to give a prepared  
3 statement at this time.

4 If that's the case, please press star one  
5 on your phone, again that is star one on your phone to  
6 be entered into the queue. And with that, moderator,  
7 could we have our next speaker please?

8 THE OPERATOR: Yes, we have Representative  
9 Jermaine Johnson, go ahead, your line is open.

10 REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: Hello everybody,  
11 can you all hear me?

12 MR. KLUKAN: Yes, we can hear you.

13 REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: Okay, thank you.  
14 Yes, I have a couple of questions on here. Well the  
15 first thing, I live in this area, I represent part of  
16 Lower Richland, so this directly affects myself, my  
17 family, and my constituents. So, I have a few  
18 questions about what's going forward, and what the  
19 NRC is proposing to do about it. Up until today I've  
20 been hearing 40 year, 40 year, I've talked to  
21 Westinghouse, and it's been 40 year, 40 year, 40 year.  
22 But then in this slide show that we've been watching,  
23 I saw 20 years about something, so if somebody could  
24 address that, I would really appreciate that.

25 Because I don't see a point in doing 40

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 years, I've said this multiple times, over, and over  
2 again. That I appreciate what Westinghouse is  
3 attempting to do now, as of last year, what they've  
4 been attempting to do. However, still, 40 years is  
5 pretty much beyond a lot of our lifetimes, some of the  
6 people who are on this call may not even be here in 40  
7 years. So, this is just a concern for me.

8 The other question is how could myself,  
9 and I guess anybody else on this call, receive a copy  
10 of the slide show that you all presented on, if that  
11 would be possible for me to receive?

12 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Hi representative, this is  
13 Diana Diaz-Toro. Welcome, and thank you for  
14 participating today. We can certainly get you a copy  
15 of the slides of tonight's presentation, and they're  
16 available on our website, but surely our regional  
17 state liaison officer, Mr. John Pelshack (Phonetic.)  
18 will be sending you the link for the slides. So, with  
19 respect to your question about the 20 year license  
20 renewal that you saw today on the slides, and heard me  
21 describing, the National Environmental Policy Act  
22 requires federal agencies to assess the potential  
23 impacts on the environment from the proposed action.

24 And the proposed action in this case is  
25 the request from Westinghouse to renew its license for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 40 years. From the no action alternative, and that  
2 means that the NRC would not renew the license, would  
3 deny the license renewal request basically, and also  
4 the National Environmental Policy Act requires that  
5 the federal agency assess reasonable alternatives.  
6 And so the NRC staff looks carefully at reasonable  
7 alternatives, and identified a shorter license term.

8 And we identified the 20 year license term  
9 as a reasonable alternative. And so, in our draft  
10 environmental impact statement, you can review the  
11 NRC's evaluation of those three alternatives, the  
12 proposed action, the 40 year, the no action, and the  
13 20 year license renewal, and the findings for those  
14 three. Does that answer your question?

15 (Simultaneous speaking.)

16 REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: Okay, so just for  
17 clarification --

18 MS. DIAZ-TORO: I'm sorry, go ahead.

19 REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: Just for  
20 clarification, so as of today the NRC does not support  
21 40 years, but the NRC could support a 20 years?

22 MS. DIAZ-TORO: There are three  
23 alternatives that were analyzed, yes, and the other  
24 thing that I forgot to mention representative, is that  
25 in addition to this environmental review, the NRC also

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 conducts a safety review of the license renewal  
2 application review, and the final licensing decision  
3 is based on that safety evaluation report, where the  
4 safety review is conducted. And that's going to be  
5 completed early next year, calendar year 2022. So  
6 that, there is also an ongoing safety review.

7 REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: Okay, all right,  
8 well thank you again, just as I'm closing off, and  
9 just to reiterate that I have a two year old son right  
10 now, and in 40 years, he could potentially be a grand  
11 father by the time they come up for a license renewal,  
12 and I just don't think that's a smart decision. So,  
13 thank you so much.

14 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you again for your  
15 questions, and comments, and for participating in the  
16 meeting this evening. Are there any other elected  
17 officials, or representatives of elected officials who  
18 would like to speak at the time? If you would, please  
19 press star one on your phone. Again, that is star one  
20 to enter into the speaker few, and then give  
21 individuals a few moments to do that. While we're  
22 waiting, I would just note that some of you are making  
23 use of the Webex chat box, if you'd like to make a  
24 written comment, again I mentioned in an earlier slide  
25 the various ways you can submit written comments to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the NRC, by email, via website, what not, or just by  
2 mail, good old mail you can send in written comments.

3 We aren't capturing what's in the chat as  
4 a comment, so if you would like it to be captured as  
5 an official content to the EIS, please unmute your  
6 phone, and say it out loud so to speak during the call  
7 this evening to make sure that it's captured as part  
8 of the transcript, which is why we're asking people to  
9 do that. And also so that other people can hear it,  
10 for those who are just merely participating via the  
11 phone.

12 Okay, it looks like we have some other  
13 individuals who have entered the queue, moderator, can  
14 we have our next caller please?

15 THE OPERATOR: Our next caller is Robert  
16 Reese, you may go ahead.

17 MR. REESE: I've already made a comment.

18 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you again Mr. Reese,  
19 can we move onto our next speaker please?

20 THE OPERATOR: Our next caller is Chakisse  
21 Newton, you may go ahead.

22 COUNCILWOMAN NEWTON: Hi, can you hear me?

23 MR. KLUKAN: Yes, we can hear you.

24 COUNCILWOMAN NEWTON: Thank you. This is  
25 Chakisse Newton, and I represent Richland County

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 District 11, which includes part of Lower Richland  
2 that runs adjacent to the area where the Westinghouse  
3 plant is, and I wanted to follow up, and really  
4 reiterate the concerns that Representative Johnson  
5 made regarding the time line for the proposed renewal.  
6 But I also wanted to ask a follow up question, because  
7 I wasn't clear on the answer that you gave to  
8 Representative Johnson.

9 So, there are a lot of concerns that  
10 you'll from the community, that I also share, but I am  
11 really concerned about the 40 year licensing request.  
12 That is a very long time, and there are those of us on  
13 the call, and on the Webex who haven't been alive for  
14 that long, and so just would really encourage us  
15 looking at shorter licensing renewals for the plant.  
16 But just to follow up on Dr. Johnson's question,  
17 because again, I apologize, I didn't hear the answer  
18 clearly, it said that you evaluated three options.

19 You evaluated basically the denial option,  
20 you evaluated the 20 year option, and you evaluated  
21 the 40 year option. Are you recommending the 20 year  
22 option as your preferred stance?

23 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Thank you, for  
24 participating, and welcome, this is Diana Diaz-Toro.  
25 In the environmental review, we assess the findings

1 that we made, was that for the 40 year, and for the 20  
2 year license renewal alternative, the impact to all  
3 resources were small, except for ground water  
4 resources. And impact from ground water resources, we  
5 found that those would range from small to moderate.

6 For the no action alternative, we also  
7 found that impacts would be small on most resources,  
8 except for ground water, similar to the proposed  
9 action in the 40 year, and also a moderate impact on  
10 the socioeconomics. Now, the NRC staff is required to  
11 conduct a safety review in accordance with the Atomic  
12 Energy Act, which is the act that governs the NRC, the  
13 Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And so that review is  
14 ongoing.

15 We are not favoring the 40 year, or the 20  
16 year, or the no action alternative at this time,  
17 because none of the reviews have been completed at  
18 this time representative. So, we're not favoring  
19 either, or, we're right now, in the middle of the  
20 environmental review seeking comments from the public,  
21 and from external stakeholders as part of that  
22 process, and I hope I answered your question.

23 COUNCILWOMAN NEWTON: You did, may I ask  
24 a follow up question?

25 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Sure ma'am.

1 COUNCILWOMAN NEWTON: So, I heard you say  
2 that at this time, you are not making a recommendation  
3 because the review is ongoing. Do you have an  
4 approximate time line for when the NRC would  
5 definitively say this is our recommendation, and this  
6 is the time line that we recommend?

7 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Yes ma'am. So, the  
8 current schedule is for the final environmental impact  
9 statement to be issued in February of 2022. And then  
10 our NEPA, our National Environmental Policy Act  
11 decision would be issued in March of 2022. The safety  
12 evaluation report, which will document the safety  
13 review of the license renewal request would also be  
14 issued around March of 2022, and at that time is when  
15 the NRC staff expects to issue its licensing decision,  
16 or make its licensing decision.

17 COUNCILWOMAN NEWTON: Thank you.

18 MS. DIAZ-TORO: You're welcome.

19 COUNCILWOMAN NEWTON: And then when you  
20 make your decision is that final, or is that a  
21 recommendation that then triggers another round of  
22 public input?

23 MS. DIAZ-TORO: At that time it would be  
24 the final decision.

25 COUNCILWOMAN NEWTON: Okay, and this is my

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 last question, which is more of a response, and I'll  
2 let others speak. It's probably part of your plan  
3 anyway, but if you could reiterate throughout the call  
4 what those opportunities are for the public to  
5 continue to give input, and what the deadline is for  
6 that process since once this wraps up you're going to  
7 come back to us with a definitive recommendation. And  
8 thank you for your time.

9 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Absolutely ma'am, and I'll  
10 take that first opportunity now. Comments on this  
11 draft environmental impact statement, or the public  
12 comment for this draft environmental impact statement  
13 ends on September 20th. You can comment tonight  
14 verbally, and Brett will let you know how to do that,  
15 or you can send written comments in. Written  
16 comments, you can do so via email to the following  
17 email address, [wec\\_cssf\\_eis@nrc.gov](mailto:wec_cssf_eis@nrc.gov). And you can also  
18 leave us a comment via voicemail, and I'm going to  
19 look it up, but for those that are seeing me on the  
20 web, I'm going to look somewhere else just to read you  
21 the 1800 number.

22 It is a standard toll free number you can  
23 call from any phone, 1800-216-0881. You can also go  
24 to [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), and search docket ID NRC-2015-  
25 0039. Thank you, Brett.

1 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you again for your  
2 questions, and your comments. Again, if you're an  
3 elected official, or representative of elected  
4 official, please press star one at this time if you'd  
5 like to speak. Moderator, could we have our next  
6 speaker please?

7 THE OPERATOR: Our next speaker is Pamela  
8 Greenlaw, your line is open.

9 MS. GREENLAW: Thank you very much for  
10 having a long session this evening, so that we can  
11 cover these questions. Actually in your EIS, you did  
12 state that you had a predecision that you really do  
13 favor the 40 year license, I just want to correct  
14 that, because I think that what you said, and what you  
15 wrote might not be matching. But anyway, I believe  
16 that you should change your time table, I agree with  
17 the previous speakers that trying to come up with a  
18 final draft, and decision before the public gets to  
19 look at all of the information is short sighted, and  
20 unfair.

21 It doesn't help the NRC, it doesn't help  
22 Westinghouse, it doesn't help the community. A 40  
23 year license, it makes -- there is no reason for it.  
24 I read what you had written in the draft EIS, and  
25 there's no logic to it. It's going to prevent -- let

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 me try to stay to my script so I don't get very  
2 emotional here. Regulation 10CFR54.31B caps renewed  
3 licenses at 20 years, and a renewed license may not  
4 exceed 40 years, and that's the remaining time on  
5 current license plus license renewal period.

6 And there are exceptions that can be made  
7 for that, one of them is the safety record, to which  
8 we have no access, because it hasn't been completed.  
9 So, I believe that this particular hearing that we're  
10 having on the publication that is incomplete is  
11 insufficient, and we need to have another public  
12 meeting after the documents are complete. On the  
13 criteria of safety record alone, a 40 year span of  
14 time is unsubstantiated. There is no proven safety  
15 record, effective record at this time that  
16 Westinghouse has.

17 They don't have a proven safety record we  
18 can go by. They've made improvements, but they  
19 haven't proven themselves, and other people will cover  
20 that some more later. A 40 year span is also  
21 premature based on NRC's own analysis. In January,  
22 February of this year, 2021, the NRC held public  
23 meetings to consider technical issues in guidance  
24 development related to license renewals for 40, and  
25 for 100 years. In February of 2020 NRC sought

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 technical information for 40 year licenses for aging  
2 facilities.

3 All the commenters on those public  
4 hearings roundly decried the effort of NRC to extend  
5 these licenses without having means to follow up on  
6 solving technical, and safety issues, and  
7 participating in development of guidance documents.  
8 So, this idea of a 40 year license is very premature.  
9 It also prevents the NRC, and Westinghouse from being  
10 required to include the public. I agree with Mr.  
11 Reese, who knows what's going to continue after a 40  
12 year license is granted.

13 It just doesn't work. I think that  
14 another thing to look at is that because Westinghouse  
15 is aging, the DEIS should have included full seismic  
16 structural evaluations for the classification C  
17 standard. All the buildings, and structures need to  
18 be evaluated, that is part of the environment, it is  
19 exactly where the workers are living, and working  
20 every day. So, let's now look at human nature, when  
21 industry loses a sense of accountability to the public  
22 because, well they don't have to listen to us, they're  
23 not obligated by law, or regulation to communicate  
24 with, meet with, or request comment.

25 For example, here's a glaring example,

1 last month, all these are recent, but just to put this  
2 in context, NRC had a predecisional, you all like to  
3 make predecisions, predecisional enforcement  
4 conference with Interseas Riverbend Nuclear Station  
5 concerning upper personnel's three willful, not my  
6 words, NRC's word in their letter, willful violations  
7 named in an inspection report. And human nature under  
8 pressure at Westinghouse itself, with COVID they've  
9 had to reduce, and spread out staff.

10 That's fine, it's what you have to do for  
11 the safety. On the other hand, the owners, Brookfield  
12 Assets Management is a private equity firm with their  
13 headquarters in Bermuda. They want Westinghouse to  
14 continue to produce at the rate they've been able to,  
15 and in the future even increase it. So, we have  
16 different pressures on human nature here, working.  
17 So, we can not predict what's going to happen in 40  
18 years. Westinghouse has to have permission, a license  
19 for special nuclear materials.

20 Here's something else from your own  
21 organization, NRC, the Office of the Inspector General  
22 published an audit of the NRC's material control, and  
23 accounting inspection program for special materials in  
24 March of this year. Recommendations included a need  
25 for qualifications to be strengthened, material

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 control, and accounting training needs to be updated.  
2 And yet the end, that program will reduce the  
3 frequency of inspections from annually to once every  
4 two years. And according to that report, the  
5 headquarters staff are not always made aware of the  
6 inspection reports.

7 Staff has to go where, you're going to  
8 laugh, they have to go to ADAMS, and look it up. And  
9 none of us want to deal with ADAMS, even people in  
10 NRC, it's just too wonky. So, there are lots of  
11 reasons not to have a 40 year license. If you -- not  
12 you personally, but NRC is turning this on its head,  
13 it's going to disenfranchise the community that is  
14 asking for accountability, and you're actually going  
15 to weaken your own regulatory requirements by allowing  
16 the various instances that have happened in the past  
17 to go unnoticed, and okay, well they've made a few  
18 improvements, they haven't proven their safety record.

19 And I'm going to get off, and I may come  
20 back on later, because I have some other concerns, but  
21 I just wanted to ask you to respond to those things,  
22 because I didn't make this up, these are from NRC.  
23 And it seems that NRC is not in sync with itself, or  
24 with the public. The prior hearings that were held,  
25 everybody who was commenting on looking at developing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 guidance documents for extended licenses, that process  
2 hasn't been completed, and here we are jumping the  
3 gun. Thank you very much, please respond, I'd  
4 appreciate it.

5 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Pamela, thank you, this is  
6 Diana Diaz, and I want to thank you for bringing up  
7 that the draft EIS indicates that there is a  
8 preliminary recommendation about the proposed license  
9 renewal. So, I want to clarify my response to the  
10 representatives just before you came in. And what I  
11 was trying to explain is that the final licensing  
12 decision has not been made, but yes, Pamela, like you  
13 said, and representatives, I humbly apologize that I  
14 might have confused things a little bit more.

15 But there is a preliminary recommendation  
16 based, and it's a preliminary recommendation, right?  
17 That unless the safety issues mandate otherwise, based  
18 on the safety review, which is what I was emphasizing  
19 when I was talking about the different alternatives,  
20 so I apologize again. So, there is a preliminary  
21 recommendation about the proposed 40 year license  
22 renewal be made based on the preliminary findings on  
23 this draft EIS. But the point was that, the point  
24 that I wanted to make was that the NRC has not  
25 completed the environmental review, or the safety

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environmental review, and that decision will be made  
2 next year, in March of 2022. So, I wanted to clarify  
3 -- I'm sorry Pamela, go ahead.

4 (Simultaneous speaking.)

5 MS. GREENLAW: (inaudible) A hearing  
6 please. I'm sorry.

7 MS. DIAZ-TORO: I'm sorry, I'm not -- can  
8 you repeat your question Pamela?

9 MS. GREENLAW: Will you have a second  
10 public hearing after these other documents, and issues  
11 have been visited by NRC?

12 MS. DIAZ-TORO: That is a request that I  
13 will take with me, and we'll consider it Pamela, thank  
14 you.

15 MS. GREENLAW: Thank you.

16 MS. DIAZ-TORO: So, again, I apologize for  
17 that inadvertent mistake, and there is a preliminary  
18 recommendation in the EIS that the license be renewed,  
19 again, unless safety issues mandate otherwise, which  
20 that safety review is not favoring any of the  
21 alternatives that I've discussed. So, thank you  
22 Pamela, and to the representatives as well.

23 MR. KLUKAN: I want to thank you again for  
24 your questions, and comments. Again, right now I'm  
25 just looking for elected officials, or representatives

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of elected officials at this time. Usually we start  
2 the meeting with them out of respect. We will get to  
3 members of the public, so are there any other elected  
4 officials at this time, or representatives of elected  
5 officials who would like to speak? Please press star  
6 one.

7 And while we're waiting for that, I would  
8 just again point out that I still see some substantive  
9 comments, and questions being entered into the Webex  
10 chat. The Webex chat is primarily there so you can  
11 resolve any technical issues you're having, whether it  
12 be on the phone bridge, or seeing the screen, or  
13 accessing materials, what not. If you'd like to have  
14 your comment added to the official, or be treated as  
15 official comment to the EIS, you can submit them in  
16 the ways that Diana mentioned before, and again, we'll  
17 put that slide up at the end of the meeting on the  
18 various ways that you can submit things officially.

19 So, the chat is just there to address,  
20 kind of like a technical resolution box, as opposed to  
21 a way of submitting comments just for your awareness.  
22 Okay, it doesn't look like we have any additional  
23 elected officials who would like to speak this  
24 evening. Now, I'm going to open up to members of the  
25 public, okay? So, could we please have members of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 public, even if you're a representative of another  
2 organization, and I'd like to go to those who have not  
3 had an opportunity yet to speak. Please press star  
4 one on your phone at this time, okay?

5 So, right now let's go with just people  
6 who have not yet had an opportunity to speak. Please  
7 press star one, and then we will circle back to  
8 people, as time permits, who have already spoken this  
9 evening. We'll give people a few seconds here to  
10 queue up. Moderator, whenever you're ready, could you  
11 unmute the next speaker?

12 THE OPERATOR: Our next speaker is  
13 Priscilla Preston.

14 MS. PRESTON: Thank you. Again, my name  
15 is Priscilla Preston, and I would like to briefly list  
16 all the various reasons why I feel that Westinghouse  
17 should not be allowed a 40 year license. The existing  
18 NRC license failed to prevent extensive radioactive,  
19 and hazardous pollution over the last 50 years, which  
20 threaten air quality, ground water, and surface water.  
21 The draft EIS has described the ground water  
22 contamination, as David mentioned previously, as  
23 moderate.

24 And moderate is defined as environmental  
25 effects are sufficient to alter noticeably, but not to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 destabilize important attributes of the resource. So,  
2 that's a serious problem, and then I think later in  
3 the draft EIS it talks about that there's a statement  
4 that it's not going off site, but then later it says  
5 -- I don't know where it's going, let me see if I can  
6 get the exact wording on that. It said current ground  
7 water contamination is not likely to travel beyond the  
8 property boundary, and there's remediation with the  
9 state.

10 But then later, it said uncertainties  
11 remain about the ultimate fate in transport of ground  
12 water contamination at the site. So, that alone is a  
13 sufficient reason not to allow the renewal of the  
14 license for any amount of time. But I would like to  
15 list some of the other things. The NRC in general  
16 just hasn't sufficiently prevented, or provided  
17 remedies for the previous discharges. So, until those  
18 previous discharges have been corrected, or until NRC  
19 can be certain that they're not likely to happen  
20 again, we shouldn't extend the license.

21 Again, the ground water contamination is  
22 the main concern from a health, and environmental  
23 point of view. And the NRC, and Westinghouse have  
24 failed to properly address the disproportionate, and  
25 harmful impacts of future facility operations on the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 surrounding poverty area frequently referred to as the  
2 environmental justice community, including the  
3 cumulative, and synergistic impacts of other sources  
4 of pollution in the area. And as Chief Mitchum  
5 mentioned, Hopkins is designated as a medically under  
6 served population, and area, and as such it requires  
7 a higher level of protection from contaminants which  
8 could threaten the health of the community.

9 Also as Chief Mitchum mentioned, an  
10 intensive archaeological survey has been scheduled,  
11 and they have already started, but it's not likely  
12 that that survey will be completed before the NRC  
13 makes a decision about the licensing. So, that is  
14 again, I think Chief Mitchum explained that in detail,  
15 that's another strong reason for not -- for either  
16 extending the decision, well extending the decision  
17 date, and also the Green Hill Mound, and the Denely  
18 Cemetery (Phonetic.) are a major source of concern  
19 that should be considered in more detail, and given  
20 more consideration.

21 So that the area of potential effect of a  
22 new license should be increased to include the Green  
23 Hill Mound, which is a priceless archaeological site.  
24 Then there's the issue again, that it's already been  
25 mentioned about the test wells that are installed in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 close proximity to significant archaeological  
2 resources such as the Denely Cemetery. One thing that  
3 hasn't been mentioned is the problem of Westdine, I  
4 believe that's been considered out of scope.

5 But I don't think that the fact that you  
6 have a nuclear weapons facility, something making TP  
7 bars for nuclear weapons within the same facility, and  
8 it's unclear how it's regulated, and what sort of  
9 contaminants are coming from it, that's a huge  
10 concern. So, before any additional licensing goes  
11 into effect, we need to know who is responsible for  
12 that facility that's on the Westinghouse property.  
13 So, considering all of the above, I am requesting the  
14 no action alternative, and I thank you for giving this  
15 opportunity to comment.

16 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you very much for your  
17 comments. Again, we appreciate you participating in  
18 the meeting this evening. Moderator, could we please  
19 have our next speaker please?

20 THE OPERATOR: Our next speaker is Chief  
21 Michelle Mitchum, your line is open.

22 CHIEF MITCHUM: Thank you. I wanted to  
23 follow up with a couple of more things that came to  
24 mind, and this is just, you may not be able to answer  
25 these questions, but really quick, the DHEC conducted

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 a public meeting in Hopkins for Lower Richland County,  
2 and counseled county residents in 2019 I believe, has  
3 that happened again? Has DHEC, to your knowledge, has  
4 DHEC conducted a new public meeting based on the new  
5 draft?

6 Also has the consent agreement between  
7 DHEC, and Westinghouse, and apparently AECOM, has that  
8 been amended since the issuance of this draft, or will  
9 it be amended? And does the Westinghouse pollutant  
10 effect freshwater fish hatcheries that are in the  
11 area? I bring that up because one fish hatchery in  
12 the state is named after one of our ancestors, the  
13 Glenmore Shawry Hatchery (Phonetic.) so I'm concerned  
14 about that, because there is a fish hatchery in West  
15 Columbia, I'm not sure what the distance is from that,  
16 but that's the Cohen Campbell Hatchery (Phonetic.)  
17 and also the Barnwell Hatchery.

18 Barnwell is where waste from Westinghouse  
19 has been shipped in the past. So, there's a concern  
20 about Barnwell county, who is watching Barnwell County  
21 with the waste products? And also this new location,  
22 I think is Greenview, Idaho, where waste materials are  
23 being sent, who is watching that? In the draft  
24 statement, the statement is on one of the pages says  
25 some soils near the plant buildings have been

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 contaminated, but soils away from the operational area  
2 have only been minimally affected to date, but you  
3 state that while it is noticeable, it is small.

4 You also wrote that under the consent  
5 agreement, Westinghouse would accept remediation  
6 efforts, which are expected to disturb surface soils  
7 only near the plant buildings. But as previously  
8 discussed, we already see a discrepancy in the impact  
9 statement where this is being put into the Congaree  
10 River, so obviously that can't be correct. There was  
11 also a statement that any soil contamination would be  
12 remediated during decommissioning if that were the  
13 case, which funding is assured under NRC's  
14 decommissioning funding regulations.

15 So, that tells me that the NRC has already  
16 looked at, if we do nothing, we take no action, the  
17 funds for decommissioning is available, so again, I'm  
18 going back to my earlier statement about economic  
19 impact, and how much it's going to cost to  
20 decommission if there is no action, and the current  
21 permit is expired. It's almost as if you're saying  
22 we've got enough money to cover it, but it's going to  
23 cost Hopkins a lot of money.

24 Also there was a statement in the draft  
25 that the existing ground water samples data indicate

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that the contaminant plumes resulting from the past  
2 activities at the site currently remain on site, and  
3 occur only in surficial aquifers, while actions taken  
4 by Westinghouse in response to past contaminations,  
5 releases have been reduced, the license in the future  
6 inadvertent releases with continued operation, it  
7 seems to be expected.

8 Future inadvertent releases of  
9 contaminants to the subsurface area are reasonably  
10 foreseeable considering the uncertainties about past  
11 leaks, and the potential for the risk of leaks to  
12 increase as the plant ages. So, again I go back to  
13 what I said earlier, is we're trying to foresee  
14 something where we have evidence from the past, and  
15 also there's the aging component of the plant itself,  
16 and what's already there. How can we be certain, even  
17 bridges have to be updated, how can we be certain that  
18 these current components are going to hold up over the  
19 next 20, or 40 years?

20 Additionally the current ground water  
21 contamination is not likely to travel beyond the site,  
22 but obviously it is, because somewhere else in the  
23 statement it says that it is. Has the NRC considered  
24 past flooding problems in the area that do exacerbate  
25 the inadvertent release of contaminants beyond

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Westinghouse site? It's a 52 year old plant. What  
2 factual evidence does the NRC rely on to conclude that  
3 the continued aging of the plant, and the significant  
4 uncertanties that affect the evaluation of rates would  
5 only propose small to moderate ground water impact?

6 If the ground water impact measure is  
7 being small to moderate, and predicted to have little  
8 change over the next 20 to 40 years, why has  
9 Westinghouse, AECOM, and DHEC agreed to install these  
10 additional, I think I said 32 new wells, or whatever  
11 they are, monitoring wells? The summary requested in  
12 January basically adds these new components, which  
13 raises the question, if this is supposedly small, to  
14 moderate in safety, why do we need 32 new wells to  
15 monitor everything?

16 What best science methodologies, or best  
17 practice standards has the NRC directed Westinghouse  
18 to implement to eliminate exceeding water quality  
19 standards of uranium in residential screening levels  
20 if the pollutants, and contaminants are limited to  
21 Westinghouse site only as previously indicated, why  
22 are Mill Creek sediments affected by the Westinghouse  
23 activity? Has the NRC fined, or reprimanded  
24 Westinghouse for past exceedance of water quality  
25 standards, and the current exceedance of uranium

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 residential screening levels in Mill Creek sediments?

2 And that's a quote right out of the draft,  
3 since 1969. And based on the evidence, the evidence  
4 based history of Westinghouse, the NRC seems to have  
5 concluded that the, and I'm quoting again, the  
6 cumulative impacts to ground water, and surface water  
7 from past, and current operations are moderate, and I  
8 have to defer back to a previous commenter that this  
9 sounds very high risk to me.

10 And again, I'm concerned about the people  
11 who are there right now. There is an explanation that  
12 if a no action decision is rendered, and the current  
13 Westinghouse license expires, potential impacts on  
14 socioeconomics would be moderate because the plant  
15 would cease to operate, and begin decommissioning  
16 activities. The decommissioning, which we've already  
17 established, is going to be, funding is available to  
18 handle that, would likely cause Westinghouse to employ  
19 a smaller work force than the current work force.  
20 Decommissioning activities would also be temporary,  
21 and eventually the employment, and other economic  
22 activities associated with the site would end,  
23 resulting in a noticeable adverse impact on the local  
24 economy, and I'm quoting out of the thing again.

25 But again, I think that the local economy

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 issue is a short term issue. Hopkins is in a hub  
2 zone, and it's in what's termed an opportunity zone.  
3 So, there's no way to know what Hopkins will be in  
4 five years, whether Westinghouse is there, or not.  
5 And I do feel that the hazardous impact seriously  
6 outweighs the guessing of what might be, even in ten  
7 years, either way. I think that this whole thing  
8 needs to just be shut down, and stopped immediately,  
9 personally, but I don't get to make that call.

10 But I do question who is monitoring the  
11 waste that has been shipped to Barnwell in the past,  
12 and is now being sent to Idaho, and if someone could  
13 answer at least that one question, I would greatly  
14 appreciate it, thank you.

15 MR. KLUKAN: Okay, again, thank you for  
16 your questions, and comments. Let me just chat with  
17 the NRC staff for one second. Okay, we just wanted to  
18 confer with respect to your last question, we'll get  
19 back to you with respect to that one. So again, thank  
20 you for your questions, and your comments.

21 CHIEF MITCHUM: Thank you.

22 MR. KLUKAN: So, moderator, could we have  
23 our next speaker please?

24 THE OPERATOR: Yes, our next caller's name  
25 is Tom Clements, your line is open.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CLEMENTS: Okay, can you hear me?

2 MR. KLUKAN: Yes, we can hear you.

3 MR. CLEMENTS: Yes, thank you very much.

4 My name is Tom Clements, and I'm the director of the  
5 Savannah Riverside Watch nonprofit organization based  
6 here in Columbia, South Carolina. And I haven't  
7 prepared any oral comments, but I'll make a few  
8 comments. I do have about 20 pages of comments that  
9 I'm going to submit before the end of the comment  
10 period, but first let me make a few points.

11 The unplanned releases to air, and ground  
12 water, and ongoing ground water contamination are the  
13 biggest concern to the local area, and beyond. And I  
14 want to make a comment on that as related to the  
15 ground water slide that was presented. It basically  
16 concludes, as does the draft EIS, that future  
17 inadvertent releases to the subsurface are reasonably  
18 foreseeable. But then it's been said before, the NRC  
19 staff found that impacts to ground water would be  
20 small, to moderate.

21 There is absolutely no way to predict the  
22 impact of future releases, whether they be through  
23 regulatory operations that had some failure, or a  
24 larger accident. So, I don't see how any conclusion  
25 could be made about the impact of future inadvertent

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 releases. Also in that slide, it said there's a  
2 potential for risk of leaks that increase with the age  
3 of plant components. I have looked through the draft  
4 EIS, and basically that's repeated, but there is  
5 absolutely no discussion in the document about how  
6 aging components would increase the risk of some type  
7 of inadvertent release.

8 That has to be discussed in the  
9 environmental impact statement process. Now,  
10 concerning something that a lot of people have spoken  
11 about is the 40 year license. I'm concerned that the  
12 impacts of a ten year license with certain conditions  
13 has not been reviewed in the draft EIS. Savannah River  
14 side Watch, and many others call for a license period  
15 of no more than ten years to be considered. I didn't  
16 hear anybody at the public scoping meeting, or other  
17 meetings voice support for a 20 year license  
18 extension.

19 So, I don't know where that came from, and  
20 reading the draft EIS, I can't determine why a 20 year  
21 license was chosen by the NRC when people spoke, not  
22 necessarily in favor of a ten year license, but the  
23 impacts of a ten year license should be reviewed. The  
24 EIS scoping process summary report from February  
25 mentions that the commenters call for a ten year

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 license extension, but then it's not included in the  
2 document that was put out. So, I'm quite concerned  
3 about that.

4 The document also says at the beginning  
5 that, let me quote this, concerning a renewal term of  
6 20 years. The NRC staff found that the potential  
7 environmental impacts from this alternative would be  
8 similar to the potential impacts from the proposed  
9 action, except that the impacts would occur over a  
10 shorter time frame. I mean that is totally ludicrous.  
11 The impacts of operating for 40 years with inadvertent  
12 releases, and MPDES discharges, and air discharges,  
13 there's no way it's the same.

14 So, I question the conclusion that the NRC  
15 seems to have made, that the impacts of a 40 year  
16 license, or 20 year license are essentially the same.  
17 We have seen a lot of inadvertent events, and  
18 accidents over the past five years, and basically, the  
19 NRC admits there will be future inadvertent releases.  
20 So, comparing the 20 years to 40 years as NRC has done  
21 is just totally incorrect. And let me comment on two  
22 other issues, one is technetium.

23 It wasn't encouraging to see on page 3-45  
24 of the draft EIS about unknowns related to technetium  
25 99. It says with little information about the timing,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 location, duration, volume, and inventory of past  
2 technetium releases, it is difficult to draw  
3 conclusions about the processes that have resulted in  
4 observed TC99 behavior at the site. Yet, the  
5 conclusion is the impact is, I think it was small, to  
6 moderate. We don't even know where the material came  
7 from off site.

8 It says it was released, probably from the  
9 cylinder recertification building on site, but the NRC  
10 has still dodged putting into a document like this  
11 where the technetium came from. It probably came from  
12 a fuel fabrication facility in Ohio, or Kentucky.  
13 Anyway, that has to be addressed in the EIS. So, one  
14 final thing about the tridium rod fabrication, the  
15 tridium producing burnable absorber rods. This makes  
16 the Westinghouse facility a dual military commercial  
17 facility, no way around it.

18 And that is of real concern from a nuclear  
19 nonproliferation perspective, but concerning potential  
20 waste from the facility, the EIS made the  
21 determination, as was said earlier, that the TP bar  
22 issue is outside the scope. Yet there was no  
23 documentation, or comment, or anything, explanation as  
24 to why it was determined to be outside the scope.  
25 They left the issue as hanging. This has to be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 addressed. Now, I'm writing a report about the TP bar  
2 matter, and I want to reveal a little bit to everybody  
3 who is listening right now, that contradicts what the  
4 NRC has said.

5 The NRC has said that the DOE's National  
6 Nuclear Security Administration regulates the TP bar  
7 fabrication, but NNSA is not a regulatory agency, as  
8 the NRC knows. Now I want to quote from DHEC this  
9 month. DHEC has issued the air, and MPDES permits for  
10 the Westinghouse Columbia Fuel Fabrication Facility,  
11 and the facility is registered as a large quantity  
12 hazardous waste generator. Hazardous waste generated  
13 at the facility, including any hazardous waste  
14 resulting from the production of the TP bar assemblies  
15 is managed under the Westinghouse Fuel Fabrication  
16 Facility hazardous waste registration.

17 Yet the draft EIS totally excludes TP bar  
18 fabrication, and thus the waste streams, from  
19 discussion. DHEC further told me a couple weeks ago,  
20 all of the manufacturing at the Columbus facility is  
21 done by the Westinghouse Columbia Fuel Fabrication  
22 Facility, including the manufacture of the TP bar  
23 assemblies. Westinghouse Government Services does not  
24 have manufacturing operations at the Columbia  
25 facility.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Then, a few days later, in response to  
2 another question, DHEC said we do not have any permits  
3 issued to Westdine, and Westdine does not have any  
4 manufacturing operations at the Westinghouse fuel  
5 facility, and for those of you that don't know,  
6 there's a little bit of confusion of who is producing  
7 the TP bars, is it Westdine, or the subsidiary  
8 Westinghouse Government Services. DHEC says it's  
9 Westinghouse.

10           So, if it's Westinghouse, the draft EIS  
11 needs to discuss the waste streams that are being  
12 managed by Westinghouse, and I'll conclude with a  
13 citation, or a reading from a Freedom of Information  
14 Act request response that I got from the National  
15 Nuclear Security Administration concerning the NNSA,  
16 NIS for the Westdine contract, and this was from 2017.  
17 It says the contractor, who they indicate is Westdine,  
18 will provide for ultimate disposal of waste products,  
19 including coordination with Pacific Northwest Labs as  
20 appropriate from the fabrication process.

21           And the contractor is responsible for the  
22 waste. So, what is going on with TP bar  
23 manufacturing? I don't care who is licensed to do it,  
24 it sounds like the waste is going to the Westinghouse  
25 side of the plant, and this needs to be discussed more

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fully in the environmental impact statement, and I'll  
2 file my probably 20 page report on the matter for the  
3 record. Thank you very much.

4 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you very much for your  
5 comments, and for participating in the meeting this  
6 evening. Moderator, could we have our next speaker  
7 please?

8 THE OPERATOR: Yes, Grace Gifford, your  
9 line is open.

10 MS. GIFFORD: Thank you. Again, Grace  
11 Gifford, I live in Horry County, my congressman, Tom  
12 Rice, has spent a lot of time recently dealing with  
13 flooding. We have money to buy out many homes, and  
14 the fact is that we really don't know where the next  
15 flood is going to come. I expect the same thing is  
16 true in Hopkins, and with the recent tropical  
17 downpours that we've had cars washing off the road  
18 from not even a hurricane, just some rain, it does  
19 concern me that there is a building that has toxic  
20 substances in it that could be swept out by flood  
21 waters.

22 So, the intergovernmental panel on climate  
23 change, ITCC has come out with their report, code red,  
24 and one of the things that they specify is that it  
25 would take 20 to 30 years to see how global

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 temperatures stabilize. So, a 40 year lease, or  
2 permit would be well beyond the 20 to 30 years. So,  
3 things with our climate are happening very quickly,  
4 and we need to not make any assumptions that we know  
5 how water is going to go, or what our weather is going  
6 to be like.

7 So, the other thing I wanted to mention  
8 was something that is dear to me because of my work in  
9 the field of speech language pathology, we know that  
10 our little guys, fetuses, and small children respond  
11 differently to environmental impacts than grown ups  
12 do. And Dr. Shanice Swan, and Dr. Leo Trisandy have  
13 really laid out this important part that the NRC must  
14 consider, and that is that the dose does not make the  
15 poison.

16 The dose makes the poison is old thinking,  
17 but now we know that it's the timing of the dose, and  
18 it can be infinitesimally small, may make the impact  
19 on a child, and provide them with lifelong challenges.  
20 So, I hope that we will consider the two issues of  
21 climate change, and flooding, and the impact on our  
22 youngest citizens with high priority. Thank you very  
23 much.

24 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you again for your  
25 questions, and comments. Moderator, could we have the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 next speaker please?

2 THE OPERATOR: Our next speaker is Chris  
3 Judge, your line is open.

4 MR. JUDGE: Good evening, my name is Chris  
5 Judge, I'm a professional archaeologist residing in  
6 Richland County, South Carolina. I thank the  
7 panelists for opening up tonight, in particular Diana  
8 has been very responsive to my inquiries. I do want  
9 to point out that in the email contact tonight was a  
10 number of people who tried very hard to get into the  
11 Webex, and it was incredibly difficult to do that. I  
12 recommend that you have a follow up session on an  
13 easier platform, such as Zoom.

14 My concerns are archaeological, and  
15 historical. I agree with Chief Mitchum, we need to  
16 expand the area of potential impact to include Green  
17 Hill Mound. You all are testing soil, and water off  
18 site, we need to consider archaeological, and  
19 historical resources off site. The Denely Cemetery is  
20 an important resource to both African, and Native  
21 Americans. There is a well installed within the fence  
22 portion, I understand it's not in the cemetery, but  
23 that consideration needs to be made.

24 I think any ground disturbances need to be  
25 monitored by a professional archaeologist. I think

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the importance of cultural resources underneath the  
2 built, and maintained grounds at Westinghouse have  
3 been seriously under considered. I realize that  
4 that's probably not a place you want to dig, it  
5 perhaps is contaminated, but creative mitigation could  
6 be applied elsewhere.

7 I agree with Chief Mitchum, that if we  
8 don't have the archaeological survey that is either  
9 about to start, or is going to start soon, if we don't  
10 have that in our hands, we can't really evaluate the  
11 effect on cultural resources under the current plan.  
12 And then finally, I believe a 40 year permit, I agree  
13 with Pamela Greenlaw, Priscilla Preston that this is  
14 far too long, and a much shorter license should be  
15 issued if we can clear up all of these environmental,  
16 and cultural issues that have been brought to the  
17 table tonight, thank you.

18 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you very much for your  
19 comments, and for participating this evening.  
20 Moderator, could we have our next speaker please?

21 THE OPERATOR: Hi Virginia Sanders, your  
22 line is open.

23 MS. SANDERS: Yes, my name is Virginia  
24 Sanders, I'm a resident of Lower Richland. My  
25 comments are just going to be plain comments. That

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 Westinghouse plant is located in the community that  
2 they call Lower Richland, as one of our previous  
3 callers spoke of. We have flooding from rain, and  
4 know that we're living in the time of climate change,  
5 and global warming. I mean last week we had rain  
6 every day, and we had flooding every day.

7 Westinghouse persists, and says  
8 constantly, and I'm assuming that the NRC agrees with  
9 them, that the contaminants that they have spilled on  
10 their campus, and the pods of uranium, and other toxic  
11 chemicals that has been spilled into the ground on the  
12 Westinghouse campus, they keep telling us that it has  
13 not gone off of their grounds. Now, we would have to  
14 be completely crazy to believe anything that they say.  
15 I mean you don't control where water flows, and  
16 Westinghouse doesn't control either.

17 So, those pods of uranium that have been  
18 sitting, I moved here 20 plus years ago, and I heard  
19 about pods of uranium sitting under that Westinghouse  
20 plant, and Westinghouse says they were not going to  
21 tear a building down to find out, or to get  
22 information on that uranium that was located under  
23 that building. And in the last years they've had  
24 spills where the pollutants ate through the concrete  
25 floors, and into the ground, and they told us that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this did not get into the ground water.

2           Again, we, the residents of Lower Richland  
3 don't believe that. They treat us like collateral  
4 damage, and we're tired of being treated that way.  
5 The Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the DHEC are  
6 the people that should be protecting us from  
7 Westinghouse, but they're not, they're not, and now  
8 they have the audacity to even consider given  
9 Westinghouse a 40 year permit with their horrible  
10 track record of safety.

11           And they're talking about cutting back the  
12 number of inspections, they're throwing us to the  
13 wolves, and the wolf in this case is that Westinghouse  
14 plant that's located about six miles down the road  
15 where I live. They have another company, Westdine, on  
16 their facility. We have been asking our DHEC office  
17 for the last two years about Westdine, and they refuse  
18 to give us information on it. They pretend that they  
19 didn't even know that Westdine was operating on that  
20 plant. Now the NRC is telling us that they're not in  
21 charge of inspecting Westdine, DHEC isn't in charge of  
22 inspecting Westdine, so pray tell, who is in charge of  
23 inspecting Westdine?

24           Who is in charge of telling us, or letting  
25 us know what kind of pollutants are being discharged

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 along with the Westinghouse discharge? Which would be  
2 a double whammy on us, the members of this community.  
3 We know that Mill Creek flows under the Westinghouse  
4 plant. That flows into the Congaree River. The  
5 Congaree River, you go a few miles down stream in  
6 Lower Richland, and that flows into the Wateree River,  
7 that goes over into another county.

8 So, not only are you polluting, and  
9 killing us here in Lower Richland, you're polluting,  
10 and killing people in other parts of the state. A lot  
11 of people, because we are an EJ community, a lot of  
12 people subsist on the fish that they catch in the  
13 Wateree River. They subsist on the fish that they  
14 catch in the Congaree River. They subsist on the --  
15 the Wateree River flows into Lake Marion, and Lake  
16 Moultrie, and there are people who subsist on the fish  
17 that they catch there.

18 So, by giving Westinghouse a 40 year  
19 permit, you're not only affecting the health, and  
20 welfare of the people in Lower Richland, but you're  
21 also affecting the welfare of people in other  
22 counties, and thousands of people. We in Lower  
23 Richland not only have to deal with Westinghouse, we  
24 have other polluters in the area. So, for you to take  
25 into consideration the air, and the water pollution

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that affects us in Lower Richland, we have, and you at  
2 NRC should take that into consideration when you talk  
3 about giving a 40 year permit.

4 It's a compound of paper mills, of coal  
5 burning power plant, of a huge land fill, and then  
6 you're going to give Westinghouse a 40 year permit  
7 without even taking into consideration the compounding  
8 affects of us living in an EJ community with all those  
9 things that are killing us health wise. A lot of  
10 people in my community don't have access to  
11 healthcare. They don't have health insurance. All of  
12 those factors should be taken into consideration  
13 before you make a decision to give Westinghouse a 40  
14 year permit.

15 And the fact that this company, as you  
16 know, and I know has a horrible record of safety.  
17 They have no safety standards, and to give them a 40  
18 year permit would be like signing a license for them  
19 to murder us, okay? That's how I see it, and that's  
20 how other people in this community who are not on this  
21 phone call, so not only am I speaking for myself, but  
22 I'm speaking for hundreds of other people in the  
23 community who feel the same way that I do. So, I'm  
24 asking you to consider, and take into account all  
25 those factors before you give Westinghouse a 40 year

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 permit. Thank you.

2 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you very much for your  
3 comments. Again, they'll be captured as part of the  
4 official comments on the EIS, and thank you for  
5 participating in the meeting this evening. Moderator,  
6 can we have our next speaker please?

7 THE OPERATOR: Our next speaker is David,  
8 your line is open.

9 MR. OVERLY: Yeah, can you all hear me  
10 again?

11 MR. KLUKAN: Yes, and can we have your  
12 last name?

13 MR. OVERLY: Overly.

14 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you.

15 MR. OVERLY: Yes, I asked questions  
16 before, and when I went back to listening to it, I put  
17 it back on speaker, I couldn't hear anything for  
18 awhile, and then all I heard was, I'm sorry I was  
19 muted, and then you went to the next caller, so I  
20 don't know if you addressed my concerns, but I had  
21 questions about how you collect the sampling, and  
22 everything like that. I get that Westinghouse is a  
23 good neighbor, they employ a lot of people, and pay  
24 good money, and everything, but using terms like  
25 moderate to describe ground water contamination, to me

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just, you don't do that.

2 You give numbers, you don't use such a  
3 subjective term, you state that ground water  
4 contamination is only in the superficial aquifer, well  
5 do you have wells into the next confining unit to see  
6 if there is contamination at a site greater down  
7 there? And my last question is this facility -- I'm  
8 sorry, I had another comment too. To me, the 40 year  
9 time frame should be reserved for the elite. That  
10 should be reserved for facilities that have caused no  
11 contamination, done no harm, done nothing wrong, those  
12 should be the ones that get the 40 years.

13 That should be like a carrot hanging out  
14 there to say hey, if you achieve perfection, you get  
15 40 years, otherwise you don't get 40 years. But my  
16 last comment is if this facility closes up, let's say  
17 the market goes down, and they decide to close for  
18 whatever reason, is there money being placed aside to  
19 say hey, here's money being held by a third party that  
20 will cover any damages we do here? So we can't just  
21 walk away from the site, and say well it's not our  
22 site anymore, you all deal with it.

23 I would like to think that there's money  
24 put aside, financial assurance that they cannot  
25 withdraw themselves, that again, a third party would

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 hold to make sure that any work that needs to be done  
2 on the site, closing it out, is able to be achieved.  
3 Thank you very much.

4 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you. I'll just start  
5 off by saying when I was trying to talk, I was just  
6 trying to grab your last name before you went back on  
7 mute. So, I'll turn it back over to the staff now.

8 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Hi Brett, this is Diana.  
9 Just at a very high level, the NRC regulations do  
10 require that the licensee has a decommissioning  
11 funding plan, and in that decommissioning funding  
12 plan, they provide an estimate, and that is require to  
13 be submitted to the NRC on a periodic basis. I want  
14 to say right now, out of the top of my head, and I am  
15 talking out of the top of my head, it's every three  
16 years. And so that cost estimate for decommissioning  
17 would also -- every three years, so yes.

18 Every three years they have to submit a  
19 decommissioning funding plan, that would include a  
20 cost estimate, and that cost estimate would assess the  
21 site, and the soil, and the contamination, and would  
22 be reflective of that. So, the answer to the  
23 gentleman's comment, to David's comment is yes, there  
24 is a decommissioning funding plant that the licensee  
25 has to submit, and it's reviewed, and approved by the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 NRC.

2 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you for that, and again  
3 David, thank you for your questions, and comments. We  
4 don't have anyone in the queue at this time. Again,  
5 if you would like to speak, please press star one on  
6 your phone, again, that is star one on your phone.  
7 We'll give people a few minutes to enter the queue if  
8 they would so like.

9 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Brett, maybe this is my  
10 cue for sharing again, how to provide comments?

11 MR. KLUKAN: Sure.

12 MS. DIAZ-TORO: And of course, as you said  
13 tonight, the email address that you can send your  
14 written comments is `wec_cssf_eis@nrc.gov`. Or you can  
15 call 1800-216-0881, and leave a voicemail. And you  
16 can go to `regulations.gov`, and search for docket ID  
17 NRC-015-0039, thank you Brett.

18 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you for that. It looks  
19 like we have a few people entered back into the queue.  
20 So, moderator, could we have our next speaker please?  
21 Sorry, maybe I was on mute, moderator, could we have  
22 our next speaker please?

23 THE OPERATOR: Yes, Pam Greenlaw, your  
24 line is open.

25 MS. GREENLAW: Thank you very much, yes,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 this is Pamela Greenlaw, can you all hear me?

2 MR. KLUKAN: We can.

3 MS. GREENLAW: Okay, very good. Okay, I  
4 wanted to reiterate a few things that I had brought up  
5 before. That the 40 year license is untenable, and it  
6 was NRC's idea to have these longer licenses.  
7 Westinghouse didn't pull it out of a hat by itself,  
8 it's something that NRC has been having meetings about  
9 extending licenses, and for no really good reason,  
10 except that they're going to have fewer inspections,  
11 and they won't be accountable to people, which is  
12 actually very oppositional to NEPA in terms of,  
13 especially environmental justice, where the goal  
14 appears to include cutting off the voice of two  
15 generations of people, parents, children,  
16 grandchildren will not be able to speak up.

17 They can send comments, but there will not  
18 be a public comment period, there won't be a deep dive  
19 into investigating what's going on. I also want to  
20 remind everybody here that NRC did not look at  
21 producing an environmental impact statement, they were  
22 fine with the environmental assessment until a state  
23 agency had the data, and said this is a real problem.  
24 And so NRC's inspections were not doing the job. And  
25 I'm not saying the people at NRC, that the inspectors

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 don't do their jobs, but they're not asked to do what  
2 our Department of Health and Environmental Control was  
3 able to do.

4           And that is not the way the NRC needs to  
5 operate. Where if they don't catch the problem, you  
6 hope the state will. So, it's another reason not to  
7 do a 40 year license anywhere in the United States,  
8 even if they've behaved well. The NRC's cutting back  
9 on inspection schedules, and they missed what was  
10 going on here, okay? Until DHEC stepped up, and I'm  
11 proud of them, I don't often say that, but I'm very  
12 proud of them, they did an outstanding job.

13           My other comment is also going to be about  
14 Westdine, and we know that you all cannot answer these  
15 questions, and yet I just want to make sure that  
16 people are aware of a couple other angles about  
17 Westdine. They have a separate -- as a subsidiary of  
18 Westinghouse, they actually are a separate company,  
19 they have their own EIN, their own way to pay their  
20 taxes to the feds, and they make money, and they're  
21 not paying the Richland County taxes.

22           They did not tell Richland County that  
23 they are a company operating in the county, that is  
24 required by law. They have been skipping out for I  
25 don't know how many years, that should alarm our

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 representatives that a company regulated by another  
2 part of the federal government, if NRC is not  
3 regulating it, that they can do this hide, and hope no  
4 one seeks game. It's patently unfair, and really  
5 borders on illegal.

6 I don't know if you all can look into the  
7 fact that Westinghouse is their cover. Certainly  
8 Westinghouse is aware that they are there, because  
9 they comingle the emissions, they're not separated,  
10 they use the same smoke stacks, they use the same  
11 other ways that they emit pollution, the way it's  
12 discharged. So, I think NRC really needs to take a  
13 close look at what Westdine is doing, and support our  
14 state, and our county, and don't allow companies to  
15 have cover for other companies who are for profit  
16 companies, and not behaving legally.

17 And I understand that's not the job of  
18 NRC, but I want the listeners who are remaining on  
19 this line to understand how serious, and compounded  
20 the issues are with Westdine. It's not just that  
21 their wastes are not separated, so we don't know what  
22 they're contributing, we don't know what the  
23 technetium plume is from, I wonder what else is there  
24 that hasn't been caught yet, and we don't know where  
25 it's from. That is no way to run any business at all,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in any way, shape, or form.

2 So, I just wanted people to be aware of  
3 that, and I'm going to put my comments into writing,  
4 that I got it submitted earlier, but the fact that NRC  
5 came up with this 40 year license business, they  
6 haven't even completed the process, and the analysis  
7 saying that the predetermination could -- 40 years is  
8 most reasonable, and there's not going to be anymore  
9 impact on the environment, give us a break. We are  
10 logical people, and that just is so much nonsense.

11 I'm very angry about it, but I'm not  
12 trying to take it out on you, but I just want to make  
13 sure that you have the message loud, and clear from  
14 everybody who has spoken this evening, that we are not  
15 ready for Westinghouse to have a blank check. We've  
16 already faced blank checks in this state from  
17 utilities, and they just take it, and they run over  
18 everybody, and that has to stop. Thank you very much.

19 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you for your additional  
20 comments. Moderator, could we have our next speaker  
21 please?

22 THE OPERATOR: Our next speaker is Diane  
23 D'arrigo, your line is open.

24 MS. D'ARRIGO: Clear Information and  
25 Resource Service, we're a national organization that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is concerned with nuclear power, nuclear waste,  
2 radiation, and the thing about this EIS, and many  
3 other NRC documents like this is that I don't think  
4 I've ever seen one that had a large impact. Every EIS  
5 I've looked at around the country, they're considered,  
6 everything is small, maybe one, or two moderate. And  
7 it's just such a nonanswer, it can't be possible that  
8 you could have, as the previous speakers have  
9 mentioned, very toxic chemicals leaked into water, and  
10 that that is not a potentially very significant issue  
11 in years to come.

12 Also with regard to the length of the --  
13 the 40 year length, the NRC is also trying to extend  
14 reactor licenses 40 years, so that they would actually  
15 have licenses for 100 years, when they were originally  
16 designed for 20, 30, or 40, and so this is a trend  
17 nationally also that we're seeing happening with this  
18 EIS, and with license extensions for reactors  
19 themselves. Like the NRC wants to not have to review  
20 on a regular basis, or -- so the length of extension,  
21 the minimization of the concerns, and the  
22 environmental justice violations really.

23 What would it take to be so contaminated  
24 that the facility would have to close? And the  
25 consequences, I'm not saying that that's what should

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 happen, I'm trying to find out how much contamination  
2 would be enough to say stop, and what it would take to  
3 clean that up? And which communities are allowed to  
4 have these higher amounts of contamination? I have  
5 not fully reviewed the whole EIS at this point, but am  
6 concerned about air monitoring, and how much  
7 monitoring is really being done off site, and how much  
8 radioactivity.

9 We've talked some about water, but what  
10 about air, and there are a lot of unanswered questions  
11 that I have that I need to look more in detail on  
12 this, but I do support the concerns that have been  
13 raised, and from a national perspective, we see that  
14 this is an important piece to the whole nuclear power  
15 fuel chain. But that should not mean that it gets a  
16 special pass on the impacts on the community. So, I  
17 guess that's really it. I wanted to express my  
18 concerns, and call on the NRC to give a tougher review  
19 of this, and other applications.

20 MR. KLUKAN: Well thank you for your  
21 comments, and for participating this evening.  
22 Moderator, could we have the next speaker please?

23 THE OPERATOR: The next caller is Robert  
24 Reese, your line is open.

25 MR. REESE: Thank you. And as this call

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 wraps up, I just want to say once again that I live  
2 three miles from this plant. I traveled to Atlanta to  
3 an NRC meeting because I wanted to voice the concerns  
4 of my family, and my neighbors, and my friends from  
5 this community. I was appalled at the NRC meeting to  
6 see nothing but lobbyists for nuclear firms. That's  
7 the only people that were at that meeting. And I  
8 wondered when our community would have an opportunity  
9 to voice its opinions, and tonight I've heard them  
10 overwhelmingly, and I guess this was the reason for my  
11 first question.

12 To what end does everybody come out, and  
13 tell you it doesn't make sense, make it make sense,  
14 make 40 years make sense, and for you to hear that,  
15 and to hear the impact of our community, and to hear  
16 our pleas, because we have a unique community. We  
17 have a community that is low lying, we have a  
18 community that is called Lower Richland, we have  
19 flooding that happens in our community, and on top of  
20 the flooding that happens in our community, at the  
21 upper end of our community it's about to be expansive  
22 residential development.

23 Which will do away with the trees, which  
24 will do away with eroding, which will cause additional  
25 flooding that goes right down to Westinghouse, that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 will then push more, and more water into the Congaree  
2 River all through that Westinghouse site. I rode by  
3 there Sunday, and there was standing water all over  
4 Westinghouse's facility. The water's just standing  
5 there after the long rain that Ms. Sanders just talked  
6 about that we had all last week.

7           And as I realized that their predictions  
8 of rain are for even more rainfall levels in the years  
9 to come, rainfall levels that would then have  
10 detrimental impact on an aging plant. An aging plant  
11 that each decade has had tremendous issues. We're  
12 talking about safety issues, there hasn't been a  
13 decade that Westinghouse hasn't had real substantial  
14 issues, safety issues. For you to then say we're  
15 going to move to give them a 40 year ticket because we  
16 just think that it's moderate, or the impact would be  
17 moderate, it's really sort of incredible to me.

18           And I'm wondering at what point will you  
19 understand that there is incredible injustice, there's  
20 incredible injustice that's happening to this  
21 community, that's happening to the people of this  
22 community, and it was selected to be in this  
23 community. It was selected that we would have these  
24 environmental injustices in our community. And for  
25 the new administration to say that they are really

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 harping on the administration's focus to deal with  
2 environmental justices, and for you to not listen to  
3 any things that the community has said, overwhelmingly  
4 it's incredible to me.

5           And I don't know all the political leaders  
6 that have been on the line, they've heard it, not one  
7 person has said that they recommend that we go with  
8 the 20 year license, everybody has said that the  
9 community is supporting a shorter license, and I don't  
10 know to what end this will matter. But I'm hopeful  
11 that the people in this community will hear loud, and  
12 clear, that it will resonate loud, and clear as a  
13 person from this community, and I don't propose to  
14 speak for the entire community, I'm speaking for a  
15 swathe of this community that 40 years is too long.

16           And now we've learned that there is an  
17 Indian mound that's on that property, or near that  
18 property, there is a historic cemetery that is on that  
19 property, it abuts the national park, which is a  
20 swamp, Westinghouse sits next to the Congaree National  
21 Swamp. It's a swamp because it gathers water, and if  
22 the swamp is gathering water, it's more likely that  
23 Westinghouse is gathering water. So, for you to not  
24 take those things into consideration, I don't  
25 understand the logic behind giving an aging, a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       diminishing nuclear plant 40 years to operate  
2       unchecked doesn't make sense to me.

3               And one last thing I will say for  
4       Representative Johnson, and Councilwoman Chakisse  
5       Newton, I will tell you that I contacted the NRC, and  
6       they said that only once have they not given the  
7       maximum time frame for a nuclear plant that has made  
8       a request. Only one time have they not given a full  
9       license to that requestor. So, for them to, I don't  
10      even understand why there was some ambivalence on the  
11      phone about how much time, or the license span that  
12      they were requiring, or that they were suggesting,  
13      because in their own records, they haven't given  
14      anything less than the maximum time.

15             It's very rarely that they do that, and if  
16      they are going to do a 40 year license, which I  
17      believe, because I don't trust that anything else is  
18      going to happen, what are the contingencies that go  
19      along with that license? I hope that we're thinking,  
20      I hope that we're planning, I'm hoping that we're  
21      organizing, and I hope that somebody is listening to  
22      the community to say that we have been wronged, we  
23      feel wronged, we feel like nobody is hearing us, we  
24      feel like we come out, and we make these statements,  
25      we make our voices heard, and nobody listens.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Nobody is listening to us, and we're  
2 wondering at what point do we get somebody to say we  
3 hear you, we understand, and it makes sense. It  
4 doesn't make sense, and I just want to make sure that  
5 we get this on the record, I'm going to submit  
6 something in writing, but I'm just appalled at just  
7 the conversation. And I started out saying to what  
8 end, to what end does this make sense?

9           People don't come to these meetings  
10 because they feel like it doesn't make a difference,  
11 and you hear the whole community telling you that this  
12 does not make sense, and we feel like hey, nobody is  
13 going to listen to us, nobody is going to do anything  
14 else, it's a corporate giant, they're going to get  
15 what they want, they're going to pollute the land as  
16 they need to, they're going to make us sick, and then  
17 nothing else happens, nothing else matters, I want you  
18 to understand that. That's the message that I hear  
19 based on all of this discussion that I've heard  
20 tonight. Thank you.

21           MR. KLUKAN: Thank you for your additional  
22 comments, and again, they'll be added to the official  
23 record as well as anything you submit in writing after  
24 the meeting. Again, if you have not yet spoken this  
25 evening, please press star one on your phone, again

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that's star one on your phone to be added to the  
2 queue. It looks like we have one remaining speaker in  
3 the queue moderator, could you please unmute them at  
4 this time?

5 THE OPERATOR: Our next question comes  
6 from Chief Michelle Mitchum, your line is open.

7 CHIEF MITCHUM: Hi again, I just wanted to  
8 reiterate thank you for this meeting. This has been  
9 a long two, and a half hours, going on three hours.  
10 I know it's been hard for all of the participants to  
11 listen to all of these comments, and not feel  
12 victimized in this, as if you wrote this all by  
13 yourself. What I have heard throughout this time is  
14 a great deal of fear of the plant. A lot of concerns,  
15 and overall a sense of the people in the area seem to  
16 feel muted.

17 They don't feel like you're hearing them  
18 regardless of what they do to be heard, it seems like  
19 they don't feel like they're being heard. I'm hearing  
20 it, and Mr. Reese did bring up Congaree National Park  
21 is right there, and I wanted to speak on that for a  
22 moment. This particular area is so significant  
23 historically. The Congaree National Park is a  
24 significant place to the area, because it records the  
25 earliest history of that area, back to the colonial

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 period.

2 And that's where, going back to the  
3 earliest records, this whole thing kind of doesn't  
4 make sense to me, because hearing all of this fear,  
5 and feeling muted, that is a generational problem to  
6 the area. These cemeteries, the mound, the national  
7 park, these are, to my people, these are remnants,  
8 these are heirlooms left to us to take care of in  
9 these cemeteries our mothers, and fathers,  
10 grandparents, and children.

11 But in the community, alive right now, are  
12 mothers, and fathers, and grandparents, and children.  
13 This area represents a huge scar in South Carolina.  
14 It represents dehumanizing, it represents slavery, and  
15 poverty, oppression, depression, colonization, and a  
16 long history of broken hearts. This area in  
17 particular was supposed to be the Sand Hills is what  
18 they called it, you couldn't grow anything there, but  
19 one of our governors in the past, Wade Hampton, had a  
20 plantation there.

21 So, there's the issue of history, history  
22 in the area is telling its presence, and that's why  
23 this is such a big step for everybody to speak up in  
24 this meeting, and make sure they're being heard. And  
25 I realize that you're recording, I realize that the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comments are being taken into context, and are going  
2 to be submitted as comments towards the draft, but  
3 again, I stress that there's so much at stake here,  
4 and our position, the tribe's position is no renewal  
5 of this license, go ahead, and let it go.

6 The expectation that anything different  
7 can happen than the past 52 years has shown is just,  
8 that's unlikely, that is predictable, because history  
9 is telling that story for us. But again, I do want to  
10 thank you all for putting this together, I know you're  
11 all tired, and the participants that have spoken,  
12 thank you all for making your voice heard. I can tell  
13 you I've heard everything, and I don't doubt that  
14 these panelists that are on here representing the NRC,  
15 I believe they've heard you too.

16 Thank you all, I will continue to pray for  
17 this community, and put them up in prayer during  
18 smudge ceremony, and I hope to hear something very  
19 soon about all of the issues that have been brought to  
20 the table tonight, thank you.

21 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you again for your  
22 additional comments. Moderator, could we unmute the  
23 next speaker please?

24 THE OPERATOR: Karen, your line is open.  
25 Karen Irick, your line is open.

1 MS. IRICK: Thank you, good evening  
2 everyone. First of all I joined the conference call  
3 a little later in the evening, so my question may have  
4 been answered. I appreciate all that I have heard, I  
5 want to say to you guys that you are just not hearing  
6 our fear. You are also hearing our anger. We have  
7 been saying this to you since I know, 2018, when I  
8 started making my voice heard in concern with this  
9 issue. I have a very simple question, and maybe  
10 you've already answered it.

11 I've put it in the question, and answer  
12 section, but my question is why are we talking about  
13 40 years guys? Chances are 40 years from now, all of  
14 us on this call will not be here. But 40 years is a  
15 very long time to consider giving folks this  
16 opportunity that has a long history of health, and  
17 safety issues, not just to our community, but to the  
18 workers themselves. And so I just, I mean I am at a  
19 loss to figure out why are we talking 40 years rather  
20 than a shorter period of time?

21 I mean when you start a new job, you have  
22 a probationary period to show you know what you're  
23 doing. Once you show you know what you're doing, then  
24 you get the job. Well, these guys have been here for  
25 a very long time, and they have not been good

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 neighbors. Now, I must admit that to 2018 they have,  
2 Westinghouse, you guys have tried, you sent out  
3 newsletters, and you are trying to keep the directly  
4 affected parties informed of things that you're doing  
5 in the community.

6 You are trying to become a good neighbor,  
7 and we appreciate that, but you still have it  
8 together, and your facility is aging just like me. We  
9 are falling apart. So, NRC, hear us, 40 years is a  
10 long time. We are not just fearful, we are angry. So  
11 please, I heard you, I heard the community, take into  
12 consideration everything that you have heard from us  
13 tonight, as well as everything you have heard from us  
14 over the years. That is my comment for this evening,  
15 I appreciate this opportunity, so I'm done, thank you.

16 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you for your comments,  
17 and for participating this evening. Moderator, I sent  
18 a message to you via the teleconference chat about  
19 adding a speaker who is having trouble getting into  
20 the queue. I'm wondering if you would be able to do  
21 that.

22 THE OPERATOR: One moment please, let me  
23 look for that person. Is it possible that you can  
24 have that person press star zero?

25 MR. KLUKAN: Could you, I think this is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 Ms. Brown, if you could press star zero on your phone  
2 to be connected to the operator? And while we're  
3 waiting to potentially connect with this speaker,  
4 hopefully we can, if you have not already spoken this  
5 evening, and you'd like to do so, please press star  
6 one on your phone, again that is star one. If you  
7 have not yet spoken this evening, and you would like  
8 to be added to the queue, please press star one on  
9 your phone.

10 MS. BROWN: Good evening everyone, my name  
11 is Erniko Brown, I am the environmental, and climate  
12 justice chair for the state conference here, the  
13 NAACP, and first off, hello to all of the wonderful  
14 people that are in this fight like Ms. Virginia, Ms.  
15 Pamela, Ms. Priscilla, Representative Johnson, and all  
16 other people who have spoken on this issue. We  
17 appreciate all of the positivity that has been brought  
18 to our community economically by Westinghouse, however  
19 there are ongoing concerns, and our community should  
20 be at the forefront of all concerns.

21 Our community has previously been  
22 negatively impacted by the harmful effects of  
23 Westinghouse. The plant was shut down for a reason,  
24 and until those reasons are clear, and concise, we do  
25 not support any license for Westinghouse. Over the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 years we have heard the countless promises that  
2 Westinghouse has provided to our community without a  
3 true commitment to our community, and the people who  
4 are placed in harm's way by them.

5 We would like for Westinghouse, and the  
6 NRC to be held accountable for the detrimental harms  
7 to our community, and know that we need direct  
8 communication with the community about things that are  
9 going on with the plant. The community should be at  
10 the heart of the decisions that are being made. The  
11 health, and the wealth of our community is at stake,  
12 and if we are overlooking the health, and the well  
13 being of the community, then building wealth is  
14 irrelevant.

15 There are still several years left on the  
16 current license, and that time should be dedicated to  
17 cleaning up the already existing mess in the community  
18 that has already been promised to the community as a  
19 priority. Our focus should be on supporting the  
20 economic development of a healthy, thriving community,  
21 and if we haven't fully cleaned up the previous toxins  
22 that have harmed our community, we can't move forward  
23 with seeing the possibility of a new licensure.

24 Furthermore, a 40 year licensure is  
25 entirely too long not to be held accountable for these

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 types of chemicals in our community. We are humans,  
2 and this is our home, please take time to empathize  
3 with us, and build with us to create a healthier  
4 community for all to thrive in. As a community we  
5 should know immediately about the things that are  
6 going on inside the plant. There should be immediate  
7 media coverage on the things that have a potential to  
8 harm our community.

9           Individuals who run these companies are  
10 individuals who live in other communities, and for  
11 them it's about business. For us, the community, this  
12 isn't business, this is our lives. It's time to stop  
13 using our communities as dumping grounds, because  
14 lives are at stake, and these companies need to be  
15 held accountable for the lives that they're  
16 potentially endangering. Furthermore, the communities  
17 need more time to process this information  
18 individually, and collectively, because it is  
19 (inaudible) process.

20           And for me, the people who represent the  
21 NRC, and the people who are representing Westinghouse,  
22 and Westdine, none of them know what it is like to  
23 live in these communities. This is an ongoing  
24 situation that needs to be handled, and it's time for  
25 people to stop using our communities. These are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 strategically placed in low income, impoverished  
2 communities that are also known as environmental  
3 justice communities. These communities are already  
4 dealing with so much, compound effects mean compound  
5 impacts, mean compound injustices on behalf of these  
6 communities.

7 Ms. Virginia so graciously stated all of  
8 the things that are going on in the community, the  
9 different companies that are there already, and for  
10 NRC, an extended year license of 20 to 40 years means  
11 fewer inspections, fewer inspections means less  
12 accountability, which means the community is more  
13 expected to exposure of chemicals. We need for you  
14 guys to see that at some point the disparities that  
15 black people have been dealing with, because this is  
16 a predominantly black community, the disparities that  
17 we have been dealing with, the climate issues, the  
18 environment issues, and these are civil rights issues  
19 that we've been dealing with for so long.

20 It's time we stopped this. It's time to  
21 stop using our communities as dumping grounds, as a  
22 means to make money. Thank you.

23 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you for your comments,  
24 and for participating this evening. It looks like we  
25 have one speaker in the queue at this time, so

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 moderator, could you unmute them please?

2 MS. GREENLAW: Hello?

3 MR. KLUKAN: Speaker please -- yes, please  
4 go ahead.

5 MS. GREENLAW: Okay, yes. This is Pamela  
6 Greenlaw, this is of course my last comment. It's  
7 actually not a comment, it's going to be a direct  
8 question. When you say you're going to take this back  
9 to the people who are making the decisions, what  
10 office is that? And who can we contact directly? We  
11 trust that you're going to do the reporting that  
12 you're supposed to do because -- Diana, you have just  
13 been able to answer all my questions these past two  
14 years that we've been working on these issues.

15 So, I'm not faulting the messengers here,  
16 however trying to send messengers where we actually  
17 should do some direct touching is what we really need.  
18 So, what office is making the decisions, and who do we  
19 need to talk to? Thank you. That's a question, if  
20 you can answer that, that would be fantastic.

21 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Hey Pamela, it's Diana,  
22 and I did hear you again. So, the office, yes, so the  
23 office at the NRC that's making the decision is the  
24 Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, and  
25 the division within that office is the Division of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Fuel Management.

2 MS. GREENLAW: Okay, I'm sorry, the  
3 division of what management?

4 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Fuel management.

5 MS. GREENLAW: That's the Office of  
6 Nuclear Materials?

7 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Materials Safety and  
8 Safeguards.

9 MS. GREENLAW: Okay.

10 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Division of Fuel  
11 Management.

12 MS. GREENLAW: Thank you so much.

13 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Sure. And Pamela, I can  
14 give you a contact in that office as well, if you  
15 would like.

16 MS. GREENLAW: Yeah, I'm sure all of us  
17 would love to have that, thank you.

18 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Sure. So, it's Mr. David  
19 Tiktinsky, and I'll spell it out for you. T as in  
20 Tom, I --

21 MS. GREENLAW: Yeah, I have his name  
22 somewhere on my list, I've got a whole list of  
23 Westinghouse people. But so everyone can have it,  
24 that would be great.

25 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Okay, let me ask my

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 colleague to pull that, the slide where we have the  
2 contact information, because I don't have the names by  
3 memory, I apologize.

4 MS. GREENLAW: I couldn't get --

5 MS. DIAZ-TORO: But I'll give -- no, one  
6 more to the other way, thank you Kelly, appreciate it.  
7 No, the other, close to the end, one more, great,  
8 perfect. Sorry, so here it is. It's 301-415-8740.

9 MS. GREENLAW: I'm sorry, I don't write  
10 fast. 301.

11 MS. DIAZ-TORO: 415.

12 MS. GREENLAW: 415.

13 MS. DIAZ-TORO: 8740.

14 MS. GREENLAW: 8740.

15 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Yes.

16 MS. GREENLAW: Okay, and you might, I  
17 guess if people can --

18 MS. DIAZ-TORO: You can always contact me  
19 Pamela, so feel free to do that as well.

20 (Simultaneous speaking.)

21 MS. GREENLAW: For the callers, spelling  
22 his name would be handy for other people on this call.

23 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Yeah, and you should feel  
24 free to contact me, as you've done in the past, and I  
25 can give you additional information if you need that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 at that time.

2 MS. GREENLAW: Okay, thank you.

3 MS. DIAZ-TORO: You're very welcome,  
4 thanks for participating today.

5 MS. GREENLAW: Thank you, all right, you  
6 have a good night.

7 MS. DIAZ-TORO: You too.

8 MR. KLUKAN: So, at this point, it doesn't  
9 seem we have any speakers in the queue. So, thank you  
10 all for participating this evening, we very much  
11 appreciate joining us for this meeting tonight, and  
12 for offering your comments. And with that, I'll turn  
13 it over to Diana to close out the meeting.

14 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Yes, thank you Brett --  
15 no, someone else --

16 MR. KLUKAN: It looks like we have one  
17 additional speaker.

18 MS. DIAZ-TORO: No problem.

19 MR. KLUKAN: Moderator, can you unmute  
20 them whenever you're ready?

21 THE OPERATOR: Mary, your line is open.

22 MS. KIRKLAND: Good evening everyone, my  
23 name is Mary Kirkland, and my question, and I hope you  
24 have an answer tonight, is that the safety portion is  
25 incomplete. So, will we have an opportunity to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 comment on the safety portion? That's one question,  
2 and can you answer that question? Hello?

3 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Yes, I'm here, I  
4 apologize, I had not unmuted my phone. So, it is not  
5 the NRC staff's practice to publish a draft version of  
6 the safety evaluation report for public review, and  
7 comment. It's not part of our process.

8 MS. KIRKLAND: Okay. So, I guess let's do  
9 that.

10 MS. DIAZ-TORO: I'm sorry?

11 MS. KIRKLAND: Okay, all right. It's not  
12 part of your requirements?

13 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Of the process, the safety  
14 evaluation review process.

15 MS. KIRKLAND: Okay, all right. So, this  
16 will be the final draft, in the final draft, are you  
17 going to have more public comments?

18 MS. DIAZ-TORO: The current comment period  
19 on the draft EIS runs through September 20th. And so  
20 yes, this is the opportunity to provide comments on  
21 the draft EIS.

22 MS. KIRKLAND: Okay. So, I heard everyone  
23 talk about, the statements that you, the NRC was  
24 considering a 40 year renewal. Why wouldn't you  
25 consider a ten year renewal with the issues that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Westinghouse is having, why was that not a  
2 consideration?

3 MS. DIAZ-TORO: We can certainly, well so  
4 if you have -- we did consider the proposed 40 year  
5 license renewal, the 20 year license renewal, and the  
6 no action alternative, right? Westinghouse currently  
7 has an operating license, and it expires in 2027. If  
8 the license is renewed, right, and that decision has  
9 not been made, the date of the license that would be  
10 renewed would be from the date that the NRC licensing  
11 decision is made. And so when you look at that  
12 considering that, and considering the current,  
13 considering the no action alternative, again the  
14 process --

15 (Simultaneous speaking.)

16 MS. KIRKLAND: Okay, I understand that,  
17 but we don't --

18 MS. DIAZ-TORO: License expiration is 2027  
19 -- yeah, when we were looking at the environmental  
20 effect of the no action alternative, the 20 year  
21 alternative, and the 40 year proposed license renewal,  
22 to us, in our evaluation it was reasonable. It also  
23 captures those ten years, but that's what we  
24 considered in the environmental impact statement that  
25 we're publishing. And so if there is, like I said,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there's a safety review that is ongoing, and the  
2 licensing decision has not been made, and we have  
3 received your comments, and hear the requests to  
4 consider ten year license terms as well.

5 MS. KIRKLAND: Okay, all right, so that is  
6 on the table, correct?

7 MS. DIAZ-TORO: The ten year renewal is on  
8 the table?

9 MS. KIRKLAND: Yes.

10 MS. DIAZ-TORO: So, let me.

11 MS. KIRKLAND: You -- go ahead, find out.

12 MS. DIAZ-TORO: So, let me see if I can,  
13 I am sorry that I'm not able to fully address the  
14 question clearly, so I have to apologize. The no  
15 action alternative, which is denial of the license, if  
16 we do that, if the NRC would make that decision, the  
17 license would run -- the facility, I apologize. The  
18 facility can continue to operate through its current  
19 expiration date, which is 2027. In looking at  
20 environmental effects, the environmental impact of a  
21 ten year license can be considered within the no  
22 action alternative given the current length of the  
23 operating license that Westinghouse has.

24 So, that's why, hopefully I'm a little bit  
25 more clear now, and then we analyzed the 20 year

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 license renewal, and then we analyzed the 40 year  
2 license renewal. Again, this is the environmental  
3 review, I want to emphasize that. I know I keep  
4 coming back to that, but it's an important part,  
5 because this is only the environmental review, there  
6 is a safety evaluation review, and that review is  
7 ongoing, and the decision will not be made until that  
8 safety review is completed.

9 MS. KIRKLAND: Okay, all right, well thank  
10 you. With that being said, you know I think my  
11 recommendation, that they do the ten year renewal,  
12 because of the safety issues, and the site that you  
13 are finding all of these contaminants, and the weather  
14 has been changing, the floods, and stuff like that, 20  
15 years is a lot of time not to have any recourse if any  
16 issue comes up. So, ten years should suffice, and  
17 that -- where we can have recourse in case issues come  
18 around due to climate change, and the aging facility.

19 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Thank you.

20 MS. KIRKLAND: Thank you.

21 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you very much again for  
22 your questions, and your comments. It looks like we  
23 have no speakers at this time, and we're at 9 o'clock  
24 as well, so again, I will turn it over to Diana for  
25 her to close out the meeting. So thank you all again

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for participating tonight.

2 MS. DIAZ-TORO: Thank you Brett, and thank  
3 you to our operator today, and to my colleague at the  
4 NRC who was managing the Webex as well. But most  
5 importantly, I want to thank each one of you that took  
6 the time out of your day to call into this meeting,  
7 and participate in this meeting tonight. I very much  
8 appreciate your comments, and your perspective. The  
9 comment period for the draft EIS ends on September  
10 20th, and so I invite you to submit your written  
11 comments via email, voicemail, and online, and you can  
12 also do so via U.S. regular mail.

13 I think with that, I want to wish everyone  
14 a good evening, and I'll adjourn the meeting, thank  
15 you.

16 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went  
17 off the record at 9:01 p.m.)

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25